

Anglican Theological Review



EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT and BURTON S. EASTON

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXVII

JULY, 1945

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

Hooker's Theory of Church and State.....	John S. Marshall	151
The Church Musician.....	Lowell P. Beveridge	160
The St. James Lesson Series.....	Matthew M. Warren	163
Early Gospel Criticism.....	Mary E. Andrews	170
The Church and Young People (Church Congress Syllabus 39)	John H. Keene and Mary S. Brisley	179
Three Documents on the History of Christianity in South Arabia	Arthur Jeffery	185
Book Reviews.....		205
Notes on New Books.....		217

PUBLISHED BY

ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

PRINCE AND LEMON STS.
LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

\$1.00 A NUMBER

\$3.00 A YEAR

Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XXVII

JULY, 1945

NUMBER 3

EDITOR: THE REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, D.D., Th.D., D.S.Litt., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: THE REV. BURTON SCOTT EASTON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, General Theological Seminary

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: THE REV. SHERMAN ELBRIDGE JOHNSON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Assistant Professor of New Testament, Episcopal Theological School

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: THE REV. PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. DONALD B. ALDRICH, D.D.
REV. LORING W. BATTEN, D.D.
PROF. FRANK W. BUCKLER, S.T.D.
RT. REV. WALLACE E. CONKLING, D.D.
RT. REV. ANGUS DUN, D.D.
REV. JOSEPH F. FLETCHER, S.T.D.
REV. ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, Ph.D.
REV. H. E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., LL.D.
REV. HERBERT H. GOWEN, D.D.
RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D.
PROF. LEWIS M. HAMMOND, Ph.D.
REV. FLEMING JAMES, D.D.
REV. ALDEN DREW KELLEY, D.D.
REV. PAUL STEVENS KRAMER, Ph.D.
REV. LEICESTER C. LEWIS, S.T.D., Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, Jr., Ph.D.
RT. REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D.
RT. REV. FRANK A. McELWAIN, D.D.

REV. DANIEL A. MCGREGOR, Ph.D.
REV. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D.
REV. RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Ph.D.
REV. NORMAN B. NASH, S.T.D.
RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.
REV. HOWARD C. ROBBINS, D.D.
REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, D.D.
PROF. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, Jr., Ph.D.
REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, D.D.
REV. CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON, Th.D.
REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D.
RT. REV. ROBERT E. L. STRIDER, D.D.
REV. JOHN W. SUTER, Jr., D.D.
REV. CHARLES L. TAYLOR, Jr., Th.D.
RT. REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, D.D.
RT. REV. H. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, D.D.
REV. THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D.
REV. WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, D.D.
REV. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, S.T.D.

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut
THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, Philadelphia
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City

NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin
TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford, Connecticut
TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia
SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois

The REVIEW is published four times a year, as follows: Winter, Spring, Summer, and Autumn numbers. Subscription price \$3.00 annually. Single copies, \$1.00.

All editorial communications and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor, the Rev. S. E. Johnson, 6 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Entered as second-class matter, August 8, 1931, at the post-office at Evanston, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879; with additional entry at the post-office at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

—
V
—

w
b
d
is
se
T
u
o
th
el
ra
ce
th
d

el
h
m
ra
h
h
b
a
th
w
h
in
f

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXVII

JULY, 1945

NUMBER 3

HOOKER'S THEORY OF CHURCH AND STATE

By JOHN S. MARSHALL

Albion College

The marvel of the Elizabethan age was its creative power, a force that brought together within a living unity diverse tendencies and ideas which when isolated were capable of developing into separate movements of civilization. This was an age that achieved its uniqueness by the richness and variety of the elements that entered into its synthesis of thought and life. It was inclusive rather than exclusive, diverse rather than concentrated, rich in the complex pattern of its creations rather than simple in the manifestations of its designs.

Richard Hooker in all of this was the child of his age and because of this fact has become the father of many movements, each of which has drawn inspiration from one of the many facets of his creative genius. But none of them has been fully representative of him because each has lacked the diversity and richness of pattern which make him the thinker that he was, a man who without contradiction and without disharmony could weave many sources into the pattern of his thought, and from these many threads of contempo-

rary life and tradition could create a design of strange beauty and magnificent variety. His is a fresh form of Christian theology and philosophy and yet it expresses the ancient faith enriched by certain new forms of earlier ideas.

It is useless to attempt to understand Hooker in terms of classifications that are foreign to his type of thought for he is not merely mediaeval or simply modern, he is not a pure Reformation Protestant or a traditional mediaeval Catholic, he is not a follower of the theory of the divine right of kings or of the Whig conception of the social contract. We can learn something of him by reading Laud and Filmer or Locke and Hoadly; but neither the Royalist nor the Whig was a true disciple of Hooker because each lacked the variety and comprehensiveness that are the most characteristic features of Hooker's thought. He never was partisan in their sense and he had a feeling of reverence for the complexity of life that forced him to do justice to many facts which they forgot. Even as great an admirer of Hooker as F. D. Maurice

feels that Hooker hardly does justice to the logic of Calvin.¹ But the marvel is that Hooker uses as much of Calvin as he does considering that he is at war with the Puritans of his day.

1. *Hooker's Method.* The method used by Hooker is simple and yet comprehensive, for it includes under the reign of law everything from God himself to the smallest pebble, and makes it our task to discover not only the law of physical objects but the legal organization of societies, nations and Churches. The law of God's own Nature is given us through revelation but we can discover the laws of natural objects and the laws of bodies politic. To be sure the laws of such human creations as bodies politic have a different character from those we discover in the objects of nature, but laws they all are and they must be investigated if we are to understand of what sort the life of man is. This conception is a synthesis of many elements; it is Biblical, Aristotelian, Scholastic, and Renaissance in origin.

It is Biblical because it considers that human inventiveness and human agreements created the State. There is a hint of the Old Testament conception of the covenant that binds a nation together and binds it to its king or ruler. There is no single divine form of the State—that is a matter of agreement between a people and its ruler—although there are better and worse forms of the State. The State rests ultimately, as an organization of ruler and ruled, on agreement; and agreement is the source of that positive law which is the very stuff of the State as

such apart from its existence as a mere society.²

It is Aristotelian because it is interested in actual society and its manifestations, in actual States and their historical developments rather than in utopias and dream creations. The State is not a thing eternal, it is not even moulded on a pattern shewed us on the Mount; it is a thing of the earth earthy and yet as guided by Divine Providence may be an organ for the making of the things of earth fair and beautiful, useful and ethical. With Aristotle he agrees that States may be evaluated in ethical terms and he holds therefore that the State is not above moral censure.³ It has its place under moral law but its nature does not place it in the realm of eternal law even though natural law and revealed divine law may be included in its legislation.

Some of Hooker's classification of law is scholastic. The distinction between positive law, natural law, and supernatural law is to be found in St. Thomas, and is embedded in the English Common Law. The same classification comes down to us in the actual decisions of the English Courts and is to be found in the writings of Coke and Blackstone and in many of the English and American Court decisions well down into the nineteenth century. It was very natural for Hooker to use this Thomistic classification to express philosophically the distinctions that are embedded in the actual achievements of the English Law and concrete developments of the law itself.⁴

² Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, in *Works*, arranged by Keble, 7th ed. revised by Church and Paget, I, xv. 1.

³ *Ecc. Pol.*, VIII. ii. 12.

⁴ A. P. D'Entreves, *The Medieval Contribution to Political Thought*, pp. 89 ff.

¹ F. D. Maurice, *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, new. ed., vol. II, p. 191.

It is Renaissance in character because it binds all these elements into one scheme with the Aristotelian conception of God as a God of Order forming the center of a system that embraces mediaeval legal conceptions and the Biblical notions of divine and human government. Here we find a Biblical conception of history, a mediaeval conception of law, and an Aristotelian conception of particularity in both man and God fitting together to form one Aristotelian-Biblical system of thought about nature and all political institutions.

With this method of approach we have a very unique type of Biblical exegesis, modern and humane, a method used later by Hammond, that gives us a highly realistic attitude towards the Bible and its historical record. For Hooker the Bible is a great historical document. God revealed Himself in the life and chronicles of the ancient Hebrews and then in the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. The record is both human and divine and as such must be understood as history, and in a real sense human history. The clue, of course, is the notion of connected meaning found in the time process. All human experience throws light on the unique record of God's relation to man more especially as revealed in a special epoch of human history.

The Bible for him is first of all a human document, a record of a certain very significant history. It is not a series of proof texts or theological propositions. To discover that this is his method we need only to study the interpretation of any historical book of the Bible in the light of its exegesis in the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. As a matter of fact the whole of this great exposition of philosophy, theology, and politi-

cal theory is fundamentally Biblical; and in using Biblical material Hooker of necessity gives an exposition of the passages which he uses. The method of interpretation is not allegorical,⁵ it is not dogmatic, it is a new method of exegesis, as fresh and vital as any form of interpretation achieved before very recent times. He sees the meaning of the passages as part of a great historical experience and finds God revealed in the lives of mortal men lived under conditions of human history.

With this method of interpreting the Bible the material for political theory derived from the analysis of the Scriptures furnishes political evidence that may be used in political theory alongside of secular knowledge. It does not follow from this that Hooker thinks that the Bible contains no Divine Revelation, that it does not reveal a higher than natural law, but it does mean that the Divine Law for man is revealed in history and is therefore linked in that general system of law under which we all live and have our being. To use Hooker's terminology, natural law and supernatural law mingle together in the revelation of the Bible, for the Scriptures are a record of that history in which God came into contact with and revealed Himself to man. Therefore we must use all our best insights into human life and its conditions to discover how man reaches up to grasp the supernatural revelation of God's meaning for us.

This method of approach throws light on the significance of the Life of our Lord as found in the Gospels. There we have the portrayal of the God-Man as the Mediator. The Divine-human his-

⁵ *Eccl. Pol.*, V. lix. 2.

tory finds its final expression in Him. He is in history and must be understood in history, but He also reveals through history That which is more than history, God, and God making history significant for us men and our salvation. With Hooker's method of interpretation the whole Biblical narrative is natural and yet more than natural, it is supernatural and yet infused with the laws of nature.⁶ Thus the Biblical narrative is unique material for the study of political theory and particularly that type of political theory that investigates the relationship of Church and State.

Again the history of the Church is most significant for his investigations. Christ is, it is true, the Head of the Church. That is the ideal phase of Church history. But Christ is also Head of the State, for all things are under His dominion. Christ is the Head of the State, and as the King of Kings is the ideal phase of secular history. But the visible Church like the State has committed grievous errors.⁷ Both have an ideal phase, but both are institutions in human history, both have a meaning in terms of human struggles and human achievements. The human and the Divine mingle in both the history of the Church and the history of the State. Hence both types of history furnish material that must be used by the student of the State and of the State in relationship to the Church. Biblical history and Church history furnish him with material unknown to Aristotle and of a character that throws new light on human institutions and their meaning for us. We must expand and modify our theories of the State in the light of the develop-

ing experience of Christian civilization as it struggles to achieve a satisfactory way of life for both Church and State.

2. Hooker's Theory of the State.

What a wealth of historical material is woven together by Hooker in his philosophy of the State, and how skillfully he works out the complex pattern of his conception of the relations of the diverse factors that enter into the whole picture! This complexity and variety have been the despair of his followers and the confusion of his enemies. Yet he abides because he is so rich and varied in his conceptions and is so adequate to the diversity of life itself.

Hooker agrees with Aristotle that the inclination to live together is natural to mankind, that the urge to come together in societies belongs to the primary structure of human nature; but he does not agree with the Stagirite that the State itself is natural, that it is as directly a result of the social tendency as sociability itself.⁸ Organized society is always in the form of the State, it is always a body politic and involves the relation of the ruler and the ruled. If there had been no sin in the world this relation of the superior to the inferior would not have appeared, for all would have obeyed the law of nature and would have lived together as equals.

Hooker is however an Aristotelian, for he believes that the State is the result of the social urge elaborated by a technique of power. But he does not think it is quite as spontaneous as does Aristotle: he thinks that there is a self-consciousness about it that Aristotle denies. Hooker thinks that the State involves an agreement, an agreement on the part

⁶ *Ibid.*, I. xii. 1-2.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III. i. 8-9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I. x. 1.

of the ruled to be ruled. This is not a contract; it is much more simple than that.⁹ However, it does have a character that when carried out in a legal sense does lead to a contractual system. Here Hooker has in mind the history of the Old Testament and the history of the English people. In the light of all that history he felt constrained to think of government as involving a constitutional element and the analysis of such an element seemed to indicate either a tacit or an explicit agreement as entering into the composition of the State.

Nevertheless Hooker does not think of the agreement as necessarily limiting the rights of the ruler to a specific character of power; the agreement may be only the assent of the ruled to be ruled by those who rule them. Hooker does not read back the English Constitution into the original State. In fact the Whig type of conception of the constitution is not in his mind at all. He only means that the State involves the psychological factor of agreement on the part of the ruled to be ruled, and he believes that without this factor there would be no State at all. Logically developed, Hooker's theory implies that there can be society without the State although not a highly developed society. He does not stress the existence of such a natural society as an historic fact, although he does seem to think that the Bible indicates such a society existed, but what he does stress is the difference between a loose association without government and the nation organized through government. So we see that for Hooker the spontaneously organized group is a result of our natural tendency, for it is just as natural as the

family and comes into existence as simply and as naturally as it did. But for him the State is another matter, it involves a factor that the spontaneous group lacks, since the State possesses a power which the mere group does not possess. Mere association does not involve an agreement, but the surrender of power to government does involve an agreement implicit or explicit that binds those within the realm together.¹⁰

Hooker is influenced in his theory by a phase of history unknown to Aristotle, the history of the Jews and the history of the Christian Church. The Jews had a conception of covenants that was fundamental with them and reflected an aspect of their thought that was foreign to the Greeks. The Greek City-State did not conceive its nature as essentially different from a perfectly natural society. It did not think it had power acquired through agreement. Aristotle conceived of sovereignty as the result of the economic organization of the group. The forms of production resulted in the ruling of one group by another. It was only when revolution intervened that an artificial organization came into existence.

Israel however had another type of history: it felt itself to be a special people whose national existence sprang from a covenant between them and God. The covenant was reasserted for each child and even though Judaism was an ethnic nation, blood alone was not enough to bind the Children of Israel together. That loyalty to the covenant with God was the theme that the prophets stressed and was also the conception that the Christians later reasserted. The most fundamental exposition of this view

⁹ D'Entreves, *op. cit.*, pp. 125 ff.

¹⁰ *Eccl. Pol.*, I. x. 8.

is to be found in *The Epistle to the Romans* where St. Paul contends that loyalty to the covenant made the Jew a Jew, and that the failure of the Jews to be loyal to this covenant disenfranchised them. Thus the Gentile who entered into this heritage and obeyed his covenanted obligations to God became heir to the great inheritance of the Children of God.¹¹

This Christian notion is reflected in the Sacrament of Baptism. Each child enters that special society, the Church, by being covenanted, pledged to an agreement with God. He promises to obey God and to live according to the Divine commands. He is not born into the Church, he is only born with the potentiality of agreeing with that rule to which he must assent to become a member of the Church.¹²

According to Hooker the State like the Church is a society in which there is an agreement to obey, to accept a certain rule over us. As the child in baptism accepts the rule laid upon him by his sponsors, so we in the State accept the rule laid upon us by those who guide us, and thus there is a type of passive assent, a type of agreement to submit to the rule of that government under which we are placed. If there were not this consent in the State there would be no power in the government, no possibility of cooperative organization in warfare, no united front against foreign aggressors or internal enemies. This agreement, this assent to be ruled, makes the State into a power group, a group with coercive dominion and influence.¹³ This factor makes an assembly into an army, a caucus into a governmental Parliament

or Congress. Without it, merely amiable sociability could not achieve that force that makes a group of dissenting delegates within a Church into a schismatic sect, or a revolting party into a revolutionary government. There is something new added that carries the forms of sociability into the realm of the State. Aristotle knew of no time when there had not been an Athens, and so for him the State seemed to be the result of mere sociability or "friendship." Hooker knew the history of Israel, knew the history of the Church, had seen in the progress of history new nations arise within older nations, older nations revitalize themselves and rise from the ashes of their death to live again. To him the nature of the State contained an aspect of sovereignty unknown to Aristotle who had not faced the problems of the new nation and the new empire.

3. *The Church and the State.* There is a legislative self-consciousness about the State that is lacking in mere society as such; there is a force and a coercion unknown to mere assemblies and congregations. It is the dynamic in the State that makes it a special creation of the higher reaches of the human spirit, a vitality and creative insistence that makes it a special part of the human communion as it reaches upward towards God. As Hooker read the history of Israel, as he traced the pages of the Christian State he came to the conclusion that the State has a certain divine right,¹⁴ a certain distinct meaning in the plan of God for the world. There St. Paul had a decided influence on his thought. Not only the historical books of the Old Testament, but St. Paul's

¹¹ *Rom.* 9. 4 ff.

¹² *Eccl. Pol.*, V. lxii. 15.

¹³ *Ibid.*, VII. ii. 2.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, VIII. ii. 6.

letters tell the story of God's leadership in the life of the State.¹⁵ This notion had its source not only in the writings of the New Testament but in the conceptions of the Fathers of the Eastern Church. The Christian State is the organ of the Divine Will, and exists by a kind of divine right. This is ancient Jewish and Christian doctrine. It may result in a theocracy, but it may find its expression in other forms than those of theocracy. St. Paul and Christian history seemed to Hooker to commit us to some conception of the divine right of the State.

This conception of the divine right of the State is very important in Hooker's thought. That does not mean that the State is perfect, it does not mean that God rules exclusively through the State; it only means that the State has a claim upon us and that that claim belongs to the State as such in the economy of God.

The Church is also a natural society and in that sense is a society with dynamic administrative functions, functions not wholly dissimilar to those of the State. It is a visible society, a body politic, and should be studied in history as such a body. It is subject to the laws of bodies politic and must conform to these laws if it is to exist as a body politic. The Church visible then is a visible body politic, but a society with certain supernatural functions and duties. These supernatural phases, functions, and duties are within its own domain, and within this realm of doctrine and worship the Church has a kind of autonomy, an autonomy born of its very supernatural character.¹⁶ But as a body politic it has a character that makes it

conformable to the laws of other bodies politic.

This leads us to another phase of Hooker's thought, a phase that is also highly significant. He was not only a product of the Reformation, and thus believed, on the ground of Biblical history, in the divine right and meaning of the Nation, he was also a product of the Renaissance and learned with other Renaissance thinkers to think of the State in terms of classical history. Hooker believed with Piccolomini and other Renaissance thinkers in the noble man in the noble State.¹⁷ Like Aristotle Hooker believed that man was a personality *par excellence* because he was a member of a great community, the State. Human personality rises to a great height because the personality is achieved in the larger whole, the State. Hooker is here an Aristotelian who has read civil history with an eye to its meaning.

The Church as a body politic should not be a society separate from the State. It should not be a separate society, it is not a supernatural kingdom united with a secular kingdom. As a body politic it should be inseparably united with the State because simply as a single society Church and State should coincide.¹⁸ This is because Church and State are two facets or aspects of one Christian society, the *Respublica Christiana*.

Hooker's position may be explained in another way. In a Christian society the population of the realm according to him should all be members of the Church. As Churchmen they fulfil the special obligations of the Church as an especially organized society; but as citizens they

¹⁵ Rom. 13, 1 ff.

¹⁶ Eccl. Pol., I. xv. 2.

¹⁷ Douglas Nobbs, *Theocracy and Toleration*, pp. 58 ff.

¹⁸ Eccl. Pol., VIII. i. 1-7.

carry out the Christian position in the whole realm of civil life. From this it is clear that Hooker does not believe in Cartwright's conception of a two Kingdom theory; he does not believe that the Christian citizen is the member of two Kingdoms, the Church as the Kingdom of God, and the State as a Kingdom of this world. Only in one sense is a man a citizen of two Kingdoms, only in so far as the visible Church has an invisible phase, a supernatural aspect connecting it with the Kingdom of God. As a member of the visible Church each citizen is a member of a society which has a political and also an ecclesiastical phase. Thus he is bound into one society exercising two functions, the functions of the Church and of the State. With this view the simplest solution of the problem of the relation of Church and State is for the rulers of the State to be Churchmen who are skilled in both phases of Society and who can administer to the needs of organized society in its entirety. Thus the national society as a body politic is both Church and State, and this close union makes it desirable that the rule of the single society should be one rule.¹⁹

Theologically this is expressed in the conception that Jesus Christ as Mediator between God and man is the Mediator of the New Covenant which is the source of the Church and is the Mediator of God's Kingship over the nations. Thus the Mediator binds the visible Church to himself through his Death and Resurrection. Actually he is the High Priest who binds the Church through his life to the purpose of God. But the ascended Lord is also King of Kings and through him God rules over the destiny of na-

tions. Through our Lord we are bound to God both as Church and State. The Nation is sanctified by his Dominion as well as the Church, and his Lordship is over both.²⁰ Thus there is good theological reason for conceiving of civilization as one pattern, a pattern in which the Lordship of Jesus Christ manifests itself in the one cultural life of both Church and State. His rule is one, and therefore the life of the Body Politic, that is the Nation, should be a united cultural pattern of Church and State.

4. *Hooker and the Anglican Ideal.* The great legacy we have from Hooker has proved embarrassing to many Anglicans because his formulations of political theory seem to reflect only the ideas and characteristics of the Elizabethan settlement and therefore appear to burden us with conceptions that should be forgotten. Yet, as we read him, he seems to be bone of our very bone and flesh of our very flesh. If he is so much a part of ourselves we should hesitate before we reject him for some recent theory of the State born of Romanticism, Hegelianism, or Pragmatism.

What Hooker is attempting to express for us in his theory of the State as based on an agreement is the fact that the individual has an autonomous place in the organism of society. He is opposed to the conception of the individual as the creation of society. The person has a real place in the State and plays a creative part in the whole, just because the Nation is an individual in a different sense from the human person. The State is for Hooker a corporate "personality" and as such has its reality in a more conventional sense than

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, VIII. i. 1-7.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, VIII. iv. 1 ff.

the human personality or even the family. The family has an inevitable character that is lacking in the State.

Hooker is attempting to show us that the developed State naturally expresses itself in the constitution which binds the sovereign as well as the citizen under the sovereign. The normal development of the constitution seems to him to indicate an agreement that lies behind the State and gives it a distinct character as an ethical being. Hooker brings together the Biblical and the Aristotelian conceptions and illustrates them by the development of the English Constitution.

Hooker's view is an enlargement and supplementation of Aristotle's. Aristotle's State is a natural organization in which some men inevitably are rulers and others are subjects. Hooker corrects this by the conception that the State is founded on an implicit agreement which is the ground of its constitutional and legal power. But Hooker is too prone to stress this constitutional phase and should be corrected by the recognition of the State as in some respects a natural organism. The progressive experience of the centuries has revealed the wider truth of much of Aristotle's theory of the State. Today we realize that not only the Community but also the State has a certain kind of naturalness and the greatest of our Anglican theorists such as F. D. Maurice and Archbishop William Temple²¹ have recognized that we are by nature political animals. Our agreements, if valid, rest on something deeper than our wills; they become effective because through them we enter into relation-

ships that are more than our wills. This is a theory towards which Hooker was struggling, as is revealed by his conception of our Lord as Mediator and King. Hooker supplements rather than destroys Aristotle.

Hooker not only asserts the place of the individual in the life of the State, but he reveals the State as a social or corporate organism. Mediaeval contractual law aided him in his thought. Like Chief Justice Coke he felt that the Common Law binds sovereign and subject within one organism. Hence the individual is moulded by the State and is shaped by the force of its power operating upon him. And this moulding is done partly through the instrumentality of law, law that expresses the order that characterizes every well-knit society. Law, Hooker saw and rightly saw, was the most important phase of civilization, the expression of the design and purpose that underlie it and make it possible, for true law is not capricious but is the stuff of all creative life.

Therein is the source of one of the most characteristic convictions of Anglicanism, the belief in reasonable law, the desire for decency and order rather than caprice and irrationality. Hooker asserts an ideal that every true Anglican has accepted from Elizabethan days to our own, the conception that a reasonable legality is necessary for true civilization and that without it injustice and chaos would destroy the possibility of normal life and development. That Hooker did not understand the possibility of many political developments that have actually taken place only proves that we have profited by the passing of three centuries; but he did put his finger on the sore spot of the

²¹ See F. D. Maurice's *Social Morality* and William Temple's *Christianity and the State*.

modern situation when he indicated that the right relation of all forms of law is the key to creative modern life, national and international. We must learn to co-ordinate with law if we are to develop the best in Church and State. That is the truth of the theory of the social contract, and that indicates the direction of our social legislation.

Again, Hooker did not solve the relationship of Church and State, but he did reveal the weakness of any theory that hopes to divide life into two domains, the sacred and the secular; for they really fuse, and unless the same society is both Christian and well governed in terms of social insight, and based on a sound knowledge of human nature and political institutions, it will not prosper. The Church is not merely a redemptive institution, it should be the source of the higher phases of our culture.

The Anglicans are by the very logic of their position in a more difficult situation than either Calvinists or Roman Catholics, for both are well suited to the two Kingdom theory against which

Hooker so valiantly struggled. The Roman Catholic like the pure Protestant can cut himself off from contemporary society, for both Calvinist and Jesuit have that in common. But the Anglican believes in being a part of the nation of which he is a citizen. He likes the law-abiding citizen and dislikes sedition almost as much as heresy. That is one of the reasons why he has furnished us with so many illustrious statesmen; he is a loyal citizen, and does not like either the pacifist or the revolutionary. But because of this loyalty, because of his belief in the national State, he can suffer acutely when a national culture forces him into a defensive position. His very loyalty is his weakness as the more independent attitude of other religious groups is their strength. What the Anglican dreams of is not a Church-dominated State—he never wants clerical leadership in political affairs—nor a State-dominated Church; but he wishes a society where the Christian ideal is the social ideal and where the Church therefore forms such a phase of society as the Christian ideal demands.

THE CHURCH MUSICIAN

By LOWELL P. BEVERIDGE

St. Paul's Chapel, Columbia University

Among the obligations of the Church which have not been assumed in some measure by other institutions, maintenance of public worship is the one responsibility which remains solely within its province. We can never be reminded too often that the purpose of such worship is to enable men to address themselves to God in terms suffi-

ciently representative to sum up their common aspirations. Nor can there be any release from the perpetual obligation to review and reconsider the means by which this responsibility can best be met.

Our first step should be to give sober thought to the disunity which is one of the greatest tragedies of Christianity.

There is no greater challenge than the hope that all Christians may one day worship together in unity of faith and purpose; liturgy built upon any other foundation is only an illusion. After nearly four hundred years, enlightened Christians see that the end of extreme sectarianism is frustration and annihilation. By stressing differences of doctrine and custom our faith is weakened and we are estranged from those who would otherwise be our brothers. Without the true spirit of brotherhood our prayers and praise are insincere and dishonest. It is only when all Christians come together as brothers that they will be able to worship God as their Father.

Much time and thought, energy and money have been spent on the external aspects of worship, but the spirit is too often lacking. Suitable buildings, equipment and staff are important, but without the spirit we shall remain impotent though modern Priests of Baal calling in vain for fire from above. The faith and the spirit must engender and enliven the liturgy; no liturgical forms however esthetically satisfying or traditionally correct and venerable will satisfy unless founded upon true faith and brotherhood. Without the cultivation of this spirit the pretense of worship is one of the most ignoble forms of hypocrisy.

While we are learning how to overcome our shortcomings it should be possible to take a few positive steps toward our goal. We should inquire into the nature and function of our Services of Worship; we should try to learn more about their real purpose, about the forms which are used, what they are trying to express and something about their origin and historical significance.

No clergyman should allow a choir to participate in a service without first instructing them in the nature of their office; nor should he fail to give his congregation the opportunity to become fully informed about the importance of their participation in the act of worship.

Most professing Christians have forgotten the real purpose of worship. Our attitude has become almost entirely subjective for the lack of any external authority which holds our respect. We think of these matters in personal terms, in terms of what we can get out of it, because we have forgotten that worship is one of man's highest obligations which should be rendered as due unto God, joyfully, spontaneously and with our whole being. Something is wrong when we have to be cajoled even into rendering mere lip service to our Creator.

Here is one of the greatest needs of our time, but unfortunately we all seem to be waiting for someone else to save us from the fatal results of our own inertia. Until men are sufficiently stirred by a feeling of the imminence of God in all His majesty, awesomeness and loving-kindness and are moved to come into His presence in utter forgetfulness of self, there can be no genuine worship. Many of us still look to the clergy for guidance, but without the support and encouragement of laymen it is an impossible task.

Let us disabuse ourselves of the notion that we can solve this problem merely by physical improvements in our church buildings or by improving the liturgy or raising the standard of church music. These are merely the machinery or at best the outward manifestation of what we are really seeking. We must go be-

yond this and examine men's hearts; there we must find material with which to build a nobler structure or fail in the attempt.

It may seem irrelevant or impertinent for a musician to make such a declaration; but, if the truth were known, there are many directors of music, who, in their failure to find a satisfactory foundation for their work, inevitably sink into a state of lethargy or indifference. The church musician is in a position to make a contribution of inestimable value, and the failure of the clergy to meet this challenge has a direct bearing upon the emptiness of public worship.

No enlightened and vigorous-minded person can deny that the present anemic state of music in our churches is a discredit to us all. Until recently such a state might have been blamed upon ignorance: today there is little excuse for it. We have a thriving secular musical culture and as people we are vigorous and enterprising. It is utterly incredible that our church music should be so weak and ineffectual; clouded by a false sense of sanctity, it is an insult to the intelligence and an offence to the conscience.

The dilemma of the church musician is tragic. On the one hand he is denied recognition by the music profession because of his narrowness, incompetence and poor taste; on the other hand he is often spurned by the clergy because of his supposed or actual ignorance of ecclesiastical, theological, liturgical or even spiritual matters. Very few men in recent years have been sufficiently resourceful or courageous to bridge this gap.

Many of the clergy, I am sure, look upon the musician as a necessary evil, perhaps not always without justification,

and it should be one of our principal objectives to do everything in our power to remove this barrier of ignorance, prejudice and intolerance. The church musician must be the servant of the Church in the same sense as the clergyman. It is unreasonable to expect him to do his job unless he has sufficient background to understand the problems and the point of view of the clergy. There is no other way by which the gap between the musician and the clergyman can be bridged. Whereas each must be trained in his own particular field, theirs is a joint responsibility which must be shared on a basis of complete equality. Each has been guilty of gross misunderstanding of the problems of the other and until this situation is recognized and some attempt made to remedy it very little progress can be made.

Legislative bodies of various branches of the Church have made reports and recommendations, but the lack of results is discouraging. Within the Episcopal Church, for example, a special order might be created, accompanied by a change in Canon Law to provide a more satisfactory status for the musician. The Guild of Organists, the Society of St. Gregory, the Liturgical Arts Guild, the Plainsong Society and the Hymn Society together with other groups could exert their influence with more telling effect.

More important than legislation, however, is the matter of training. An experimental program should be set up in several theological schools so that at least a few candidates for the profession of church musician could undertake their training on an equal footing with their clergyman partners. Opportunities should be offered those now

active in the profession to review their aims and renew their perspective at various centers which might be set up in a manner similar to the College of Preachers in Washington.

Overshadowing all other considerations is the question of leadership, the kind of leadership that is consecrated to the proposition that man's primary and greatest need is spiritual. Nothing can be more obvious at the present time than that unless man's very real state of spiritual starvation is recognized and adequately met, the very roots of our civilization will wither and die. All

sorts of artificial expedients have been tried; now it is time to try a few basic remedies. Again it should be stated that the problem of church music is not primarily a musical problem, nor will it be solved until a few leaders can be found who will unhesitatingly endorse the plan to train church musicians who will not only be adequately equipped in their special field but who by disposition and conviction can assume responsible leadership and exert vigorous, wholesome and common-sense influence in the civic, social, educational and cultural life of our people.

THE ST. JAMES LESSON SERIES

By MATTHEW M. WARREN

All Saints Church

Atlanta, Georgia

The St. James Lessons. New York: Published by St. James' Church, 865 Madison Ave.

The growing interest of the Protestant Episcopal Church in curriculum material for church schools is a very gratifying fact to those who for years have concerned themselves with this particular task. One of the efforts recently made is that at St. James' Parish in New York City, in what is now commonly referred to as The St. James Series. The series has enjoyed an increasingly wide use, and therefore the seven courses should be reviewed as a whole in order that some evaluation may be made.

TECHNIQUES

The techniques of the series may be characterized as follows:

- (1) It is a workbook technique throughout, with a teacher's guide included.
- (2) It is designed for a class period of approximately forty minutes.
- (3) In general the equipment and arrangements called for are modest: pencils, crayons, scissors, paste, tables and chairs, paper clips, as much privacy as possible, cardboard, blackboards, Prayer Books, Bibles and Hymnals, and so on. These are usually available in most churches, except, perhaps, "privacy."
- (4) Memory work is given a central place among the activities, and teachers are required to check on such assignment.

- (5) A message to Parents, which invites the coöperation of the home, is included.
- (6) Storytelling.
- (7) Prayer charts.

EVALUATION OF THESE TECHNIQUES

The techniques require

- (1) A minimum of equipment for a school.
- (2) A minimum of background for teachers; even an untrained teacher can stagger through.
- (3) A minimum of pupil activity, which is confined to cutting out, listening, and coloring or brief writing. If the home work is done, that will involve considerably more activity, but outside the school.

Comment:

(1) Techniques bow to the prevailing stereotype in our church schools—a bare forty minutes of largely transmission teaching—and this is equivalent to saying, “The Episcopal Church cannot hope to do more creative work and should be encouraged to accept the forty-minute schedule for Sunday morning.” For surely forty minutes is all the time the Church School can hope for if this type of encouragement is fostered. To employ homework as a method is practically wishful thinking, for almost nowhere will parents and children coöperate in this manner.

(2) These techniques become unbearably monotonous, if we are to believe the testimony of some of those who have taught this series or have had wide experience with church schools. There is a sameness throughout, and interest

can hardly be sustained over a period of six or seven years.

(3) Must the Church sell out to minimum teaching, minimum background for teachers, and minimum equipment? Must we be dull forever? If general education on the elementary and secondary level has anything to say to religious education it is, “Train your teachers and give them significant content and interesting and varied procedures.” This series simply does not do this. It is a “lockstep” technique which could be managed by almost any adult or even any adolescent. Surely St. James’ Parish and the rest of us can devise more vivid and compelling ways of helping our boys and girls to enter into the life of the Church and bring the Gospel to bear on the community.

(4) Memory work, as suggested here, appears to be superimposed. Those of us who have used other methods find that the most useful way to secure memory work is by constant use of such material as is to be memorized in and through the content of the course rather than by assignment as a side issue. Unless children are very different from those with whom the reviewer is acquainted, it is doubtful if much of this memory work will be done.

(5) The message to parents is a hopeful device, but one finds very little material for the parents to use in any except a most formalized manner. In the judgment of this reviewer, it will be difficult to make this effective in the modern home.

(6) Storytelling is an art, and few teachers can tell even good stories well. This series, especially in the Peter and Sandra saga, tells too many stories, if their content is to be developed and used. Jeanette Perkins, whose work

in the use of stories is well known, uses one significant story for several class sessions, thereby securing from the story its greatest meaning, and using the story as a dynamic for action. The St. James stories are rather in the area of entertainment than in educational instruction. (More will be said farther on about their content.)

(7) The prayer charts strike one as being particularly wooden and inflexible. They taste of a kind of moral bookkeeping which has doubtful value for the Christian life unless a rigorism of a fairly medieval type is what characterizes the Christian life, and its prayer habits.

It would be interesting if objective tests could be given by properly qualified people to see

- (a) What religious ideas the boys and girls develop from these courses,
- (b) What techniques appeal to children of varied social backgrounds, and
- (c) In what kind of communities the series is most acceptable.

There seems to be an underlying assumption, judging from the wide advertisement and use of this series, that it is equally useful in all parishes. Actually it appears to have the flavor of a fairly privileged group of people.

CONTENT

The content of these courses is perhaps best characterized by the word "uncritical." There seems to be little "relatedness" in the construction of the courses. By inference, or directly, children are taught that Bible stories contained in this series are literally true. The proof-text method is pushed

to its modern ultimate. The story of the fall of man, as told in Course IV (p. 54, Teacher's Manual; p. 95, Pupil's Workbook), has an even more literal quality than does the biblical version. Nine-year-old children are taught that Adam and Eve were real people; the serpent talks to Eve, and the Apocryphal story of the serpent being a fallen angel is dragged in as if it were part of the biblical text. In modern day-schools children learn that there are other theories of creation which make a literal interpretation of the Genesis story utterly untenable. The way in which this material is presented leaves no room for myth, and will eventually plunge children into conflict between science and religion in such a way as to give science the upper hand. Some of us had hoped that this kind of fundamentalism had passed. In this same course the mission of the Chosen People is "to make the world good." No attention is given the polytheism of the times of Abraham, and nowhere does one sense the break between polytheism and ethical monotheism as a development within the Hebrew religious consciousness. Surely no good purpose is served in telling Bible stories if their context is not to be considered, unless the purpose is to entertain.

There are discrepancies, which while not serious, are misleading and confusing. On p. 57 of the Teacher's Manual for Grade IV, the deliverance of the Jews from Egypt is attributed to God, and on the next page it is attributed to Moses. The thought that God used Moses would be acceptable but the course does not bring this out.

In Course II, Jacob at first thinks that the angels ascending and descending are gypsies. Where does that come

from? Elisha and many others are called "special friends of the Lord God;" this despite the New Testament—and Old Testament—teaching that "God is no respecter of persons." Furthermore, these "special friends" are constantly receiving military secrets because "they are good." Of the ascension we are told to tell children "Slowly He [Jesus] began to rise into the air," and then when a cloud blew away, the disciples could not see Him (p. 256, Course II). One wonders what this is supposed to do for children.

The above are only scattered examples, but they indicate the literalness of the courses. Bible stories are told in a way that would have been thoroughly acceptable before the rise of modern criticism, and throughout the stories seem singularly unfitted for children under twelve years of age.

Teaching the Bible to any age level is difficult, and all who attempt it would agree that it is difficult, but we do not help matters by telling to children a confused, unrelated and adult set of stories, lifted from their context and with a great deal of other material freely interpolated. Judging from our present troubles in teaching religion it would seem an unjustified hope that some day, somehow, these ideas and stories will bear fruit. The churches have tried this method before and have found it unsatisfying and misleading.

As has been indicated elsewhere, "to be good" is here presented as the key to the Christian life. Children are to be told that "probably you and I are not good enough to see angels" (Course II, p. 4, Teacher's Manual); again, "While most people are not good enough to behold that heavenly world, some few have been privileged to do so." And

forthwith the children are to be told of St. John's vision in the Book of Revelation, a document hardly calculated to mean much to seven-year-old boys and girls.

"If you love the Lord Jesus very much, and try to be His special friend, He might make it possible for you to see heaven," says the excessively benevolent father to his children, Sandra and Peter (Course II, p. 9, Pupil's Workbook). We are to exhort children to be like angels in order to become happy and please God; which is quite an assignment, since our Church has not made up its mind, except in a very evasive way, on the whole subject of angels.

Course II, p. 5, Teacher's Manual, proceeds to define angels as "a special sort of purely spiritual beings, a wonderful sort, with no bodies but only wills wherewith to serve God. If angels appear to men, they *seem to have bodies* so that we may know that they are there." That personal goodness should be related to these disembodied spirits who have fake bodies, when we are good enough to see them, is at best confusing, and would not seem to contribute much to moral achievement.

While exhorting children "to be good," the course presents a very inadequate conception of sin. In its more dramatic form sin is here presented as being quarrelsome in the family; being rude to the cook; and being thoughtless of poor people. This seems to put sin on a very superficial level and could hardly stimulate consideration of the social evils of which we are all guilty, and which no amount of good manners is likely to annul.

One would also raise a question in mental hygiene on examining materials

in Grades V and VI. As an example, take the teaching with regard to the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." The series relates this primarily to infidelity in the marriage bond, and urges the teacher to refrain from permitting it to have any other meaning. In the Fifth Grade an effort is made to commit ten-year-old children to this statement: "If I marry may God help me to remember that my dear wife (or husband) comes first, and never to commit adultery." The ten-year-old children are then to write a letter telling their unborn child what kind of a parent "I hope to be." While the teacher of this material (pp. 18 and 19, Teacher's Manual) is told not to undertake sex instruction ("it is not your province"), he still is told to "teach this commandment with emphasis on the home destroyed by adultery, rather than on the physical and psychical nature of the sin." When this question is raised, will children accept this treatment? Should children accept this treatment? Should we raise such a question if it is to be a lopsided answer which doesn't meet the issue? Furthermore, this kind of hedging is likely to create more curiosity than light and leave the young under the impression that the church considers adultery to be only one kind of sexual promiscuity. Whenever any church school teacher starts dealing in such words as "lust" and "adultery" with ten-year-old boys and girls, he will need more help than is herein indicated.

To give point to the teaching that adultery is unfaithfulness in marriage the following story is to be told to children: "Suppose a man gets tired of his wife, doesn't love her any more, goes and lives with another woman . . . that is adul-

tery." This story has within it the seeds of uncreative anxiety on the part of children. What help could it possibly give to children in their living and in their personal experiences? One can imagine some most undesirable repercussions from children not only of normal homes, but from children whose homes are broken for any cause, sexual irregularity or otherwise. This course on Christian virtues, Grade V, is entirely too adult, evasive, irrelevant, and risky. Certainly the Church has a message to all on the subject of vice and virtue, on fear and faith, but this attempt does not seem to bear the message. Goodness is not encouraged as something beautiful and desirable in itself, but only as a means of winning happiness.

In Course VI, Pupil's Workbook, p. 45, the same question of adultery related to the seventh commandment gives no additional useful information. It simply evades the issue by saying ". . . not only must we keep our bodies clean [by which is meant bathed], we must keep our thoughts and speech clean, we must try not to use bad words, and not to be indecent." This advice is rather like trying not to think of hippopotamus for ten minutes! It would seem far better not to raise an issue if we are to evade or over-simplify the facts.

Some stories in this series are positively dangerous, both in their advice and in their implications. On pp. 55 and 56, Course II, Pupil's Workbook, we are told the story of some country children who went to the seashore and who with their cousins, who lived at the seashore, went out on the rocks and were trapped there by the pounding surf. They are eventually rescued in a most unlikely fashion, but the burden of the story is that "guardian angles" hovered

above the children, one angel for each child, protecting them from "accidental peril." "Never once did the guardian angles stop in their faithful care. Above the boat they flew until their charges were safely on the shore." In the same course of study we have the story of the killing of the Holy Innocents. One wonders where their guardian angels were; one wonders where were the guardian angles of the children of blitzed England and Continental Europe; of Barcelona and Madrid. Certainly if children are to learn that accidental peril is in the hands of "purely spiritual beings . . . with no bodies but only wills to serve God," what point is there in the intelligent watchfulness and advice which parents give their children?

When this series discusses the Church, God or Jesus, or both, are constantly localized in that particular place. Such phrases as "Jesus sitting on the altar," or "God sitting on his throne," will not stand up under the questioning of maturing boys and girls. Why the writers of this material feel compelled to emphasize this sort of "now you see it (if you are good), now you don't" mystery, is hard to understand.

Grade III (approximately 8 years) consists of a course on Christian Biography in which more than thirty biographies are to be told to children on an equal number of Sundays. Is it conceivable that eight-year-old children can understand biography as such, and if they can, can they possibly digest thirty of them in thirty successive Sundays? It is not hard to see that several biographies, well told, might be helpful; but to hand out thirty can hardly be called a sensible distribution of material, nor is it likely to create appreciation of Christian saints in the way in which even the

authors of this series would desire. The quality of these stories is questionable. What is the purpose? to give information concerning certain people? Or to inspire children to noble living? The second purpose does not seem to enter into any of the stories. Finally, there is no chronological order to them, and why we must drag in St. Rose of Lima; Polycarp; St. Dorothy, or St. Elizabeth of Hungary, for the edification of eight-year-old children, is a mystery.

The whole course has many other trying aspects. Shadrach, Meschaiah, and Abednego are designated as "three boys," and, of course, the fiery furnace is made as hot as it could conceivably be. "And they stood up and walked about with the Lord in the midst of the fire" (Course I, pp. 155-56). Or take the story of the birth of Jesus, seen through the stable window by two apocryphal children, who, in the middle of the night, find the unlighted stable ablaze with light of an apparently supernatural variety. The whole account is mysterious and unchildlike and it would doubtless create nothing but confusion and an unhelpful credulity. The use of such figures of speech as "sea of glass" (Course II, p. 10, Pupil's Workbook) can hardly be helpful to children. The use of such hymns as

There's a Friend for little children
Above the bright blue sky,
There's a rest for little children
Above the bright blue sky;
A rest from every turmoil,
From sin and sorrow free

can hardly appeal to any but pathological children. To give a Lenten rule which is nothing more than a bare minimum of Christian interior discipline is not particularly valuable. The rules suggested are: (1) worship; (2) be kind;

(3) work; (4) obey. Children are supposed to check these if they have observed them. Presumably, they are to feel guilty if they did not—which of course they don't.

Seven-year-old boys and girls are told, "if we face trials or sorrow" we pray for God "to send Glory around us" (Grade II, p. 223, pupil's Workbook). What does "Glory around us" have to do with meeting life hopefully as Christians and striving to be wholesome people?

AS LITERATURE

When the writing in this material is contrasted with modern secular readers for children, it becomes at once apparent that the St. James Series is incredibly poorly written. The English is atrocious; there is a constant tendency to redundancy, and a poor use of words. The language throughout is an attempt to be "cute." The stories suggest the Victorian adult talking down to the child. The children portrayed in the stories are themselves generally smug and unreal. Here are a few examples: "O, I do like God," said Sandra. "Of course, dear," said Mother, "we all like Him very much because He is so good" (Course I, p. 224, Pupil's Workbook). "Suddenly four big, strong men dressed in queer brown rigs surrounded him" (Course II, p. 191, Pupil's Workbook).

The same Course says, p. 192: "He is a very beaten up man." In a number of places a prophet is referred to as "that old preacher man." The terminology is out of keeping with what children could possibly understand. One has no quarrel with the idea of adoration but to think that by the constant use of the term anything is gained is to suffer from illusion. The words found in

Course V, p. 92, Pupil's Workbook, such as temperance or gluttony; chastity or lust; generosity or envy; liberality or covetousness, are not normal language for this age group.

CONCLUSION

(1) One gets the impression in reading the St. James Series that learning is the result of much verbalization. There is scant room for creative experience whereby people learn to live together in the Christian fellowship. There is some talk about all this, and there are a few stories on the subject, but the main impression is that classroom conversation and "telling about it" is how boys and girls can learn the meaning of Christianity and life in the Church.

(2) The Series ignores what modern education has learned about the development of children. The language throughout betrays this, to say nothing of the general ideas the courses seek to teach—which are usually either abstractions or wishful thinking. This series will appeal to those who sentimentalize over children, but who do not seek really to know or understand them.

(3) The sections used for purposes of illustration in this review were not chosen, but taken at random. Each time a course was opened, it revealed some such inadequacy as we have pointed out. Others could have been given but it would have made the review too long.

(4) The whole attitude in the series toward moral conduct and moral behavior is disturbing. In too many cases morals are simply related to personal happiness and serve as a device to move God to action. In reading the series as a whole one gets the impression that by strict observance to rules the Christian

Community can be achieved by man, and this is a too simple understanding of the Fall, Redemption, Grace, and the Kingdom.

It is very hard to understand what the purpose of this Series is if we are to judge from the total seven courses. It ignores modern Biblical criticism; ignores the information which tireless and selfless workers in child development have made available to us; and it never comes to grips with the demands of the Gospel nor the necessity for moral achievement. That such a series could

have a large circulation in our time is doubtless due to the extreme difficulty of teaching religion and the excessive hopefulness of modern religionists.

The problem of teaching children cannot so easily be solved. How can the Church hope to be the resource it says it is, and which we believe it to be, with such easy methods and such futile religious concepts?

Wide use of this material will in the opinion of this reviewer, do nothing but create further disillusionment among teachers, parents, and pupils.

EARLY GOSPEL CRITICISM

By MARY E. ANDREWS

Goucher College

The Synoptic Problem has long been an important area of New Testament research. Form-criticism has again centered scholarly attention on the gospels. Nearly a century ago Ferdinand Christian Baur¹ with characteristic thoroughness cleared the way for his own extensive researches by a survey of previous and contemporary work on the criticism of the gospels. Baur is a particularly acceptable source for this information since a modern historian of the higher criticism could write of him in 1900, "For all his onesidedness, he remains the greatest New Testament scholar within the past one hundred and fifty years."²

¹ F. C. Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung* (Tübingen, 1847). *Einleitung*, pp. 1-76.

² Nash, H. S., *The History of the Higher Criticism*, New York, 1900, 143.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: Except where the context indicates otherwise this content is presented, in what follows, as if Baur were speaking.

The Synoptic Problem is a peculiar problem. In all literature, secular or Christian, there is nothing similar to the relationship of the four canonical gospels to each other as historical portrayals of the life of Jesus. They all describe the few years of Jesus' public life with so much agreement, at least the Synoptic authors do, that it would seem they had written with common agreement, and yet with as great differences as if each one had wanted to distinguish his story from all the rest. Their citations of each other have modified their common element and we are met with all possible variations between the extremes of verbal identity and contradiction of fact. The problem has been present since there were gospels to compare with each other, and the answers have been commentaries on the theological consciousness of the period concerned, and as is natural this factor has blurred and hindered observation of phenomena. There have been four

major attempts at the solution of the Synoptic problem: the dogmatic, the abstract critical, the negative critical, and the historical.

The dogmatic conception rests on the hypothesis that the gospels have a divinely inspired content whose author is the Holy Ghost. There are not four gospels, but as Irenaeus excellently put it, a *quadriforme evangelium* (III. 11. 8). Their unity is emphasized, their differences are minimized.

Augustine in his *De Consensu Evangelistarum*³ saw purpose, not uncertainty or accident in the order, in the peculiar mode of narration, in the deviations, and even in the gaps and omissions of the four gospels. That all the content of gospel history was not remembered in the same way does not imply contradiction. Augustine used Matthew as his basis of comparison, using the criteria of identity and difference for the determining of the relationships, and his harmonistic method dominated the field until the end of the Middle Ages when J. Gerson, the famous chancellor of the University of Paris, produced a harmony which by a very arbitrary procedure attempted so to fit the text of the four gospels to each other that they would be a *monotessaron*.

Most harmonistic attempts, however, came after the Reformation. Andreas Osiander, Reformation theologian, made the first harmony produced in the Protestant church (Basel, 1537). His title expresses his ideal: *Harmoniae evangelicae libri IV, graece et latine*,

in quibus evangelica historia ex quatuor Evangelistis ita in unum est contexta, ut nullum verbum illum omis-sum, nihil alienum immixtum, nullius ordo turbatus, nihil non suo loco positum: omnia vero literis et notis ita distincta sunt, ut quid cuiusque Evangelistae proprium, quid cum aliis et cum quibus commune sit, primo statim aspectu deprehendere queas. Osiander used Luke's Preface as his own foreword. Out of the gospels came the gospel.

The harmonistic method assumes that everything verbal and literal must be historical truth, and this method could not be more rigidly carried out than it was by Osiander; but he separated what in itself was identical, and the shortcomings of the first great Protestant harmony led to the second, begun in 1593 by Chemnitz, continued by P. Leiser and completed in 1626 by J. Gerhard. This harmony aimed to correct some of the major faults of Osiander's work. Rules were formulated for the judgment of individual cases, and these did free the gospels from the unnatural compulsion of Osiander's method. This harmony recognized the right of individuality in a gospel and accorded to each evangelist his own order and mode of narration. But if everything is always explained so that a difference dare not become a contradiction, but must always be subordinated to the unity conditioned by the ruling theory of inspiration, even the special differences are determined by the Holy Spirit and therefore are justified.

J. A. Bengel represented the freer spirit within the harmonistic method. He proceeded not from abstract rules but from exact observation of details,

³ *The Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, First Series*, New York, 1888. Ed. Philip Schaff, Vol. VI, 73-236. See especially Book I, Chaps. 1-2 and Book II, Chap. 12 of Augustine, *The Harmony of the Gospels*.

and was prepared to admit changes made by the evangelists. His greater freedom gave him a firmer grasp of the individual features of each gospel. But he never inquired after historical results, accepting the canonical order as the chronological. This kind of hypothesis limits the critical consciousness and keeps it from penetrating to the inner relationships of the gospels.

Storr marked the transition from the old harmonistic to the modern view. He united the critical and the old harmonistic methods. The apostolic character of the New Testament guaranteed the complete harmony. He put Mark as the first gospel; the more extensive gospel must arise out of the shorter. He found Matthew in a special class, originally composed in Hebrew, not Greek, so its position at the head was saved. Matthew was written soon after Mark. Luke had Mark, not vice versa, since half of Luke is ignored in Mark who transmitted Peter's information. Luke used this gospel of Peter and supplemented it through oral reports received in Palestine. Mark was the gospel for the Greeks at Antioch, especially fitting since God first called Peter to the service of the heathen. Mark was Peter's pupil and also knew the Antioch community through Paul and Barnabas. This was an attempt at a methodical basis of gospel harmony, but Baur pronounced this "trivial, ingenious pragmatism" of Storr "dry and barren."⁴

⁴ In his later volume, *Das Markus-evangelium* . . . (1851), Baur emphatically states that there is positively no trace of any preference for Peter in the whole gospel of Mark. Current criticism of Mark represents a great shift of opinion on the question of Petrine influence in this gospel. Papias' testimony to

THE ABSTRACT CRITICAL VIEW

Storr marked the beginning of the advance from the harmonistic to the critical view in his idea of tradition as dogma and in his view of the priority of Mark; even Bengel could conceive of no other order than the canonical one. The view of the priority of Mark takes a significant place in the history of New Testament criticism in that it determined the character of that criticism from Eichhorn to Strauss. Scientific, purely critical observation replaces the old dogmatic type, the lower or textual criticism is followed by the higher. The gospels are viewed as literary, not as historical phenomena.

In his *Einleitung*, published in 1804, Eichhorn introduced the "higher" criticism as the logical next step in view of the satisfactory results already achieved in the "lower" criticism. Opposition crystallized when the Gospel of John was excluded from the rest of the gospels, and the relationships of the other three were now to be disclosed through the higher criticism. Eichhorn's famous hypothesis of the "primitive gospel" is the best known expression of this new epoch in New Testament criticism. Here the principle of unity is not the activity of the Holy Spirit in the evangelists, but more materially in a *common primitive document*. Eichhorn's point of departure is the ma-

Mark as the interpreter of Peter is sufficiently vague to allow for various theories. The case for Petrine influence is persuasively stated in Chap. X of E. J. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 1937, pp. 138, 149, 151, 153, 155. But see M. S. Enslin, *Christian Beginnings*, 1938, p. 385. Goodspeed sees few traces in Mark of the use of written sources; B. H. Branscomb, *Gospel of Mark*, 1937, finds seven at least.

terial common to all three. This demands the use of literary documents; either the three evangelists have made use of each other or they have depended upon a common source. Variations are due to the fact that three different translations arose independently out of a Hebrew or Chaldean original. In none of the gospels have we the pure original text, but the first short sketch went through all kinds of hands before it was worked over for the present three gospels. The major characteristic of this hypothesis is the number of literary middlemen required. If these agree they had a common source.

Eichhorn's theory of a primitive gospel is an illuminating hypothesis and gives its author a significant place in the newer criticism. The very objections it called forth had merit because they contributed to the further development of New Testament criticism. Some of these objections were: its probability, its necessity, its scantiness for the super-structure built upon it, historical traces, etc. Hug adopted the alternative rejected by Eichhorn, that the evangelists used each other, and cited Livy's use of Polybius to show that disagreement and use were compatible.

Baur sees Hug's criticism's of the hypothesis of an original gospel as valid, noting that every unsound hypothesis makes the whole view built upon it uncertain and arbitrary. But when he asserts that the three gospels could have been written only in their canonical order he is contradicting his own premises. Hug opposed Griesbach's idea of Mark as the latest of the three. Why was Matthew so usable and Luke so unusable to Mark, or if he used both, why did he undertake so superfluous a

task? But, asks Baur, how can it be decided so certainly that Mark could not have made an abstract of the other two in some special interest rooted in the relationships of the period? It is not unthinkable that Mark arose out of the other two, but this cannot be insisted upon without further investigation.⁵

Gieseler attacked Eichhorn's hypothesis from another side: the great number of literary middlemen required for the explanation of the agreements. His own solution for the problems of Synoptic origins lies in the hypothesis of an oral gospel. In the apostolic period the gospel existed only orally, there was no early demand for gospels written for instruction, and only necessity would drive the apostles to write. The harmony of the gospels is explained more completely on the hypothesis of an oral gospel than by one of a written document. If the evangelists wrote independently, different choices would be made from the wealth of material. The same arrangement of the narratives was due to the idea of the importance of the events of Jesus' life. Deviations are explained out of the freedom of the oral gospel.

The written primitive gospel explains agreements better than the diversity; the oral gospel makes the diversity far more comprehensive than the agreements. Baur sees difficulty in the precise verbal agreement in two gospels.

⁵ Baur's investigation of Mark in his volume published in 1847 is the least satisfactory part of the whole work. Four years later his volume on Mark appeared. This was at the time when opinion was shifting to the position of Mark's priority, a position stated three times during 1830-40. Baur remained unconvinced by all his opponents.

Were there different branches of tradition? It is puzzling to see oral tradition so divided against itself and so variable. This was natural as Papias attests, but there is the problem of Luke's preface. Everything cannot go back to oral tradition.⁶

Schleiermacher strikes a middle path. He rejects the sharp alternative that either the three evangelists used each other's work or else they created out of a common source. If several common sources, why not abide by the majority? Which is earlier, a connected but meager account or many detailed accounts of individual events? Written reports of Christ's life were not necessary for the early preaching. *Form* in the writing of Christian history probably did not arise among the apostles and active disciples of Jesus. Written records came from those who had known him, and details were given, some of which were written and some were not. Later, writing became a convenience and a time-saver. Thus individual events and sayings were sketched and collections of these arose. This is a modification of Gieseler's hypothesis of tradition and Baur pronounces it "arbitrary, artificial, ingenious, trivial and dismembered."⁷

One hypothesis always called forth another, and this fact brought the so-called *use*-hypothesis into being. The

relationship of Matthew and Luke stood firm, but the relation of these to Mark was less certain. Storr put Mark first, Griesbach put it last. DeWette held Mark as an excerpt out of Matthew and Luke, Credner⁸ believed that Matthew originated in part out of a collection of sayings of Jesus, composed in Hebrew by the apostle Matthew at an early date, in part out of Mark. Luke used oral tradition, Matthew and Mark.

The Gospel of John was too widely ignored, although as early as 1820 Bretschneider had doubted its authenticity, which was a noteworthy phenomenon in the history of criticism. Eichhorn held that it arose out of polemical contemporary interests, that the Apostle John upon reaching Asia Minor found that the apostolic *Ur*-gospel was not suited to his need. He wrote a gospel which, since he was an eye-witness, set the gospel content in a clearer and more correct light. The more popular idea, however, was that it was the gospel which completed the others. There were doubts about it, yet no one doubted the genuineness of its total impression. Credner, on the basis of internal evidence, reached the conclusion that the author was a Palestinian, an eye-witness, a favorite apostle of Jesus, etc. DeWette was more skeptical and more impartial. There was little firm criticism, much vagueness and abstract subjectivity. Gieseler's tradition hypothesis is based

⁶ For a discussion of the significance of the Oral Gospel see Goodspeed, *op. cit.*, pp. 127, 129-32, 136, 182, 204. This author sees Matthew's *Logia* as the Oral Gospel and Luke's preface as referring to the Oral Gospel. Much hinges on the distinction between writing and "composing" as used by Papias. See note on page 129 for linguistic substantiation of the view.

⁷ Schleiermacher, in a sense, anticipated form-criticism.

⁸ Credner, K. A., *Einleitung in das NT* . . ., 1836, 160. Credner appears to be the father of the well-known two-source theory of Synoptic origins, which has held a commanding position in New Testament criticism for so long. See Enslin, *op. cit.*, 433 for the suggestion of the non-existence of Q and the lack of necessity to postulate Q to account for the material common to Matthew and Luke. One could have used the other.

on the idea of a double line of transmission, written and oral, while Schleiermacher's theory of many intermediate narratives is related to the *use*-hypothesis which put forward now this, now that evangelist, giving rise to many combinations. The period is marked by uncertainty and hesitation, and by the avid search for new hypotheses. There was no real seriousness of critical opinion, only hypotheses on which even their sponsors laid little weight.

THE NEGATIVE CRITICAL VIEW

Strauss' famous *Leben Jesu* of 1835 marked a new epoch in New Testament criticism, although his work reflects the whole critical consciousness of the time. It was one-sided, yet it determined future developments of criticism. He should have criticised the documentary sources of his history, but in his investigation of the New Testament for possibility of myth, he set aside the problem of the records and proposed to test the trustworthiness of the narratives. His definition of mythical was what is recognized as compatible with the known and universally valid laws of being; he made, by this criterion, a sweeping disavowal of historical reliability of the gospels, therefore why investigate them more closely to determine their relationships? But the mythical is only part of gospel history, and Strauss correctly declared that the most difficult problem in the whole province of criticism is the borderline of the historical and the unhistorical. Since the essential element of myth is miracle, the highest canon of criticism is that a history containing miracle stories can deserve no credence, not merely in what concerns the miracle, but in everything closely or remotely con-

nected with such a narrative. Thus the whole content becomes suspicious.

How was the Straussian criticism related to the critical consciousness of the time? It raised such a commotion as only a few scientific works had done. Critics received it as a masterly work, but it brought anger and alarm to many on theological and religious grounds. For many it expressed their own feelings, but the rest reacted in anger and hate, even though they should have seen how clearly Strauss' work was the natural outcome of what had preceded. He merely drew the final consequences more clearly. What Schelling had said of Fichte might also be said of Strauss, "If the time hated him, it is so because it has not the strength to see its own picture." All who up to now had lived in the good faith that they could be two things at the same time, searchingly free-minded and ecclesiastically faithful, who could hold to the one without breaking with the other, who could make use of the science of free investigation and thought without laying themselves open to the suspicion that they were opponents of positive Christianity, who could hold to the latter with all earnestness and zeal, without being obliged to give up scientific pretensions which could not be separated from the Protestant theology; all these saw themselves with one stroke bitterly deluded. The result was stupendous.

Contradictions were screamed at him, literary men or would-be literary men rushed into print denying sympathy with Strauss' views, decrying the serious consequences of those views and promising to oppose them with their full strength. Persons eager for preferment in church or state continued to condemn Strauss publicly, and very few cultured

theologians dared to quote him for other purposes than to invoke hate. Yet the great circulation of the work allows the conclusion that it expressed the consciousness of the period.

It was a necessary phenomenon. Opinion stood against opinion, mutually contradictory; nothing was firm and secure. He made further criticism possible. His greatest service will always be that he with pure, open love of truth which his better-thinking opponents never denied to him, free from preconceptions and without suppositions, made former knowledge appear as no knowledge. To know that we do not know is a position from which positive knowledge can come, and his work made a good foundation on which future criticism could build with more positive result.

The immediate critical result, however was opposition. Neander opposed Strauss' mythical view with his own historical *Leben Jesu* (1837). His work is certainly no improvement on that of Strauss. The latter was unhampered by dogmatic suppositions, which in Neander introduce a new element of caprice and interfere in his treatment of the history. Neander sacrificed the Synoptic portrayal to the Johannine, although he absolved the former from all intentional falsification of fiction, but one looks in vain in Neander for any light upon the thoroughgoing differences between the Synoptic and the Johannine presentations. He emphasized the unity more than the differences. Neander had no right to deny to Strauss his own brand of subjectivity. They agreed at one point: both undertook to produce a life of Jesus without criticism of the records. The essential difference between them was that Strauss recognized

the uncertainty of the sources and made others conscious of that, while Neander offered arbitrary assurance upon a very uncritical basis.

With Neander criticism took a step backward into the old harmonistic paths. Two new harmonists are Ebrard and Wieseler. The latter sees gospel history as thoroughly harmonious; the main problem is to unite the undeniable differences of the four gospels into a unified whole. Ebrard very properly sets himself to investigate the plan of each individual evangelist, what each wanted to write, his individual characteristics, etc., but he involves himself in contradictions in his attempt to harmonize the accounts of Matthew and John with reference to the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. His procedure is rather futile, and is really the old inspiration theory over again; when one evangelist said something more incompletely or inexactly it was not unpremediated, but came from special reasons inhering in the whole plan.

His reasoning was too much even for those who wanted ammunition against Strauss. Ebrard's view was forced and unnatural, much of it was decidedly false. Weiseler's synopsis meets the same criticism, and he did such violence to the Gospel of John in his attempts at harmony that he drew upon himself the fire of criticism for overstepping all its bounds. Instruments of torture are the figure most descriptive of what this method of chronological synopsis does to the gospels. There is no reason to boast of the refutation of Strauss' theory if all one has to offer is the work of the harmonists and of Neander. The latter sacrificed the Synoptics to John, the former tied everything together into an unnatural unity.

No wonder that the next step was a bold one, taking its point of departure from the mythical view of Strauss where the unconsciousness of myth came to its right and where the unhistorical in the gospel was seen as arising unconsciously out of myth. When myth and tradition were bound together tradition had the significance of a creative principle, now it is a vehicle for the transmission of a fixed content. But the gospels' relation to one another seems to reveal design and reflection in contrast with the unconsciousness of tradition. This leads Weisse to substitute conscious symbolism in parables and allegories and we advance from the mythical view to the idea of a creative *Ur-evangelist*. Here we have the self-consciousness of a definite individual rather than the tradition working unconsciously. Weisse held that Mark was this *Ur-evangelist*.

The name of Bruno Bauer is also linked with this approach. He differs from Strauss in that he individualized Strauss' community into one person, but this does not explain the process of gospel origins. He combated the traditions-hypothesis on the ground that continuity of historical materials from memory was a psychological impossibility, and he denied the material possibility of gospel history arising through the tradition. Community inspiration would be fragmentary; the gospels are excellent wholes. He makes a real point here, but both Weisse and Wilke preceded him in this conclusion about an *Ur-evangelist*. This is a popular view. Mark is regarded as the common basis of the Synoptic text; Matthew and Luke were expansions and partial reworkings of Mark's primary presentation.

Wilke sees the deviations within the Synoptic gospels as conscious, especially

in the sayings of Jesus. Literary caprice indicates a fixed oral tradition as basis of deviations, but he rejects Schleiermacher's view of isolated fragmentary narratives. The common source lay within the gospels. Mark is an artistic composition, in fact it is the *Ur-gospel*. But, insists Baur, Wilke had not investigated Mark closely as an historical document, he employs only the quantitative norm in judging the gospels and the shortest may as well be an abstract as the common element of gospel tradition. Undoubtedly, adds Baur, the relations of the four gospels are to be construed from within themselves, but the present state of affairs can only be compared to a labyrinth from which there must be some way out. He is sure that he has found the way to break the vicious circle.

THE HISTORICAL VIEW ⁹

Any critical advance will start from the criticism of Strauss, since there has been no real advance in his successors. There can be no valid criticism without criticism of the records, nor is there true and effective criticism unless it is accompanied by indifference to result and freedom from subjectivity. Strauss' criticism had its influence here and Baur attacked the problem of the mythical in gospel history from another angle than that of Strauss. How did the evangelists regard their material? Everything mythical is unhistorical, but not everything unhistorical is mythical; much that is similar to myth has been preserved through the free

⁹ Much of this section has already appeared in another article by the writer, "*Tendenz versus Interpretation*," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII, Part 3, 1939.

creativity of the author relating it. The great problem is not the objective reality of this or that narrative, but rather how the author regards his material. Only thus can one decide concerning the borderline of the historical and the unhistorical, "the most difficult problem in the province of criticism." We must find the author's special interest. Every writer belongs to his time and his motivation is to be sought in his period. Failure to realize this fact has kept previous criticism superficial. If one could learn from one of the evangelists the secret of his idea of the gospel, criticism could proceed on a firmer basis. The best gospel for that purpose is John. In the third edition of his *Leben Jesu* Strauss retracted his doubts about John's authenticity and in the next edition he expressed doubts about the doubt! Such vacillation will be impossible when we have evidence from at least one gospel that it is more than a simple historical narrative, that it can also be a *tendenzschrift*. *Tendency* writings are products of their time and hence are historical. This view anchors itself in the relationships out of which the writings proceeded. The more unprejudiced and conscientious, the more exactly it demands everything that can give information on the origins of the gospels, the less it can fail in reaching the highest possible degree of probability in its results.

The century since Baur has seen the continuation of the study of the Synoptic problem. We have the two-source theory almost in the position of dogma,¹⁰

¹⁰ Dibelius, M., *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, 1936, says (pp. 55-56), "The Two Source

the multiple source theory of Burton and Goodspeed, and the four-source theory of the late Canon Streeter, the two latter theories attesting the incapacity of the former to bear the whole critical load put upon it.

Form criticism, which for nearly a quarter-century has occupied the attention of German New Testament scholars, Bertram, Bultmann, Dibelius and K. Schmidt, to mention the most prominent, has been of less significance in England than in America. English scholarship leans heavily on the four-source theory of the late Canon Streeter, although with some hospitality to German scholarship. In America opinion is divided. Some scholars accept the main emphases of form criticism but deery its terminology, and among its more zealous advocates there is the tendency to supplement its literary side by more attention to the historical and the sociological emphases. Of the German form critics Dibelius enjoys the greatest influence. His books appear promptly in English translations and are accorded favorable reception. His emphasis on the preaching as the means of crystallizing and creating the gospel tradition has its points of contact with Baur's insistence that the situation out of which a writing came gave direction to that writing. Baur talked about party-relationships; the form critics' *Sitz im Leben* is the modern counterpart.

theory is better able than any other to explain the synoptic interrelationship. . . . It only falls into disrepute if one attempts to draw from it an explanation of all details of synoptic interrelationship and underestimates the other possibilities of oral tradition, some special sources of small extent, and finally the accommodation of the gospels to each other in the manuscripts of the New Testament."

Church Congress Syllabus 39

THE CHURCH AND YOUNG PEOPLE

By the Rev. JOHN H. KEENE, rector of Christ Church, West Englewood, New Jersey, and Lecturer in the Department of Pastoral Theology, General Theological Seminary; and Miss MARY S. BRISLEY, Lecturer in the Department of Pastoral Theology, General Theological Seminary, formerly Executive Secretary of Youth Consultation Service, Church Mission of Help, Diocese of Newark, and at present engaged in giving institutes on the problems of youth for a Federal Social Agency.

The previous articles in this series of the Church Congress Syllabus on the Anglican Tradition have for the most part analyzed and set forth the particular contributions of that tradition. It has been stated that this tradition has a quality and emphasis that are of inherent value to the Church. We are now concerned with suggesting where the Church may establish more enduring and meaningful relations with young people in the age group of 13 to 21, and we hope to stimulate the reader to think through these relationships in the light of his own experience with and understanding of the practices and thought within the Anglican tradition.

There is no written history of youth. But there is in our time a tremendous amount of activity among public and private agencies concerned with helping young people to train themselves for adult life. The Episcopal Church has a Youth Commission, reflecting the growing attempts of our communion to relate the Church to young people as a distinct group. Every priest has the responsibility to provide religious education for the youth in his parish. We all are concerned with what is involved in fulfilling this responsibility, and to what extent and under what circumstances our youth are absorbing and utilizing their religious training. The method fol-

lowed in this paper is to set forth five questions, the answers to which, while far from exhaustive, ought to provide helpful material for discussion. The questions are as follows:

1. What are some of the social characteristics of the age group of 13 to 21?
2. How are these reflected in their relation to the Church?
3. What do case records of a Church Social Agency reveal about the relation between personal standards of conduct and the teaching of the Church? Or, how does the content of religious education take final form in the mind of youth?
4. What do the facts discovered suggest for further study and action by the Church?
5. In the light of the foregoing, wherein can the clergy be of aid to Church Social Agencies (and other agencies) in working with youth?

I. What are some of the social characteristics of the age group of 13 to 21?

1. On the whole, youth groups in churches and such organizations as the Boy and Girl Scouts seem to have an attraction for the 13-15 year old youth. From 15 years on, there is a marked drop in interest.

2. Also for the 13-15 year age range the sexes are quite distinct social groups, even in opportunities provided for them to mix together in social gatherings. The unexpressed formula appears to be that there is safety in numbers in getting

acquainted with the opposite sex. From 15 years on, the "pairing off" is obvious.

3. The age range of 15-18 covers youth who are conscious of being neither totally dependent upon nor independent of home controls. This has a reaction in terms of establishing self-created groups (free from adult leadership) where an identity of their own kind is maintained. This may be described as a phase of cult experience¹ and it can be definitely anti-social, such as group participation in stealing, or it can result in forming clubs for athletic and social activities, and it can sometimes be definitely exclusive of other similar age groups. A study was made by the University of Newark of certain social conditions in Newark, and in one "underprivileged" housing area approximately 13 self-organized boys' clubs existed within an area of four blocks. In certain sections of northern New Jersey, High School students have organized their own fraternities and sororities; the State law forbids the existence of such groups under official school sponsorship. This cult experience, motivated by a need for identity, is one of the chief characteristics of youth, with definite implications calling for recognition of and exploration by the Church. Suggestions will be given in the course of this paper.

II. *How are these characteristics reflected in youths' relation to the Church?*

In the age group of 13-15, attending Sunday School seems to be motivated by a desire for similarity of social expression and is not primarily an indi-

¹ The word *cult* is here used in its derivative or sociological sense of a group worship experience which draws peculiar strength from an essentially exclusive nature. This exclusiveness may be temporary or permanent.

vidual quest for instruction. Joining a confirmation class because one's friends are in it is a primary motive. There are possible inferences to be made from parochial experience that can be mentioned here because they throw light upon this and other age groups. The child, beginning at about age 4, has a curiosity about the "whys" of life which is applied as naturally to theological questions as to the why of rain. "Who is God? Where is Heaven? Who made God?" are well known questions of the child. This kind of natural curiosity is not as frequently expressed by the 13-18 year old group, unless directly stimulated by adult leadership. It has been mentioned that from 15 and on, there is a falling away from Sunday School and secular groups, with certain exceptions to be noted later. When young couples marry it is also observed that they tend to drop church attendance, albeit they did attend during the courtship period. The early years of marriage appear to make certain demands which take a toll upon church attendance. When children of these couples become of Sunday School age, their parents begin to return to church, or take a more active interest in parish activities.

In older age groups of 16-18 some church groups, such as the Young Peoples' Fellowship or the Girls' Friendly Society, are fairly successful in holding their members, but in the majority of cases adult leadership and responsibility are the backbone of their success. It is of interest to note that boys serving in the Acolytes' Guilds retain their membership over a longer age period than other church groups, and do not require as much external stimulation to carry through their responsibilities. It is quite common for boys in these Guilds to carry

on through their High School years, to serve at the altar in their college communities, or to continue at the home parish even though they have begun to go to business. It is also to be noted that boys who will not become members in other parish groups will respond to membership in the Acolytes' Guilds. These facts are worthy of further thought by parish priests seeking to reach their young men and boys.

III. *What do case records of a Church social agency reveal about the relation between personal standards of conduct and the teaching of the Church?*

Those who are in trouble and come to an agency have little or no articulateness in religious concepts. (This does not prove they would not be in difficulty if they were articulate.) On the whole, the cases reveal a lack of tie-up between religious concepts and morals. But this is also true of those who are not in trouble and who carry on a fairly consistent Sunday School or church life. Cheating in confirmation class examinations is not an unknown occurrence. A discussion group of "privileged" youngsters in a Sunday School started from the triumphant recital of the way in which some of the group got free rides on busses, sneaked into the movies, etc. The quite serious consensus of opinion was that this was not stealing, nor dishonesty, nor contrary to church teachings. It was all right because none of them really needed the money! It was done "just for fun." If they had done it seriously, because they needed the money, "that would have made it stealing and a sin." Instances are known of consistent church attendance along with equally consistent sexual delinquency, especially among girls whose sex

experience started early. The halting explanations are usually of this sort: "Church-going is an expiation for bad behavior," or is a proof that "I'm not really bad," or that "I can straighten up when I want to." Sometimes when church attendance is carried out under some sort of compulsion external or internal, the delinquency serves as a secret punishment of those in authority, or a way of asserting the adolescent's right to a certain area of independence. At times in an unattractive, insecure youth, the Church represents the ideal but brings him or her into what seems hopeless competition with other youngsters. Delinquency seems to them a way of proving superiority or at least attractiveness in other spheres. The conclusion reached here is that whether the individual is in difficulty or not, the relation between morals and religious concepts is a vague one, and often the two fail to meet, with the former operating in the sphere of social expediency. Such a situation requires some careful thinking-through of the educational program for youth; this will be further treated in the following section.

IV. *What do the facts discovered suggest for further study and action by the Church?*

It is evident that adolescents will seek a cult experience of some sort, and it is a fallacy to assume that nothing will happen if they do not have a normal and guided one. Specifically, problem youth have had no real and sound group experience. Before following this through, let us see the high points of a case history relevant to this statement. A 16 year old girl was referred to a church agency by a parish priest to whom she had come for confession, and to whom

she later stated her fears about an impending serious operation. The social worker arranged for two further examinations by medical authorities, and the 'original diagnosis was proved groundless. This release from fear led to a desire on her part for further talks with the case worker. It was brought out that at the age of 13 she was subjected to the beginning of serious conflicts between her mother and father. Her physical attractiveness, mature for her age, soon led to several affairs with various men. In one sense, she grew up over-night, and missed out entirely in having a normal social experience with young people of her own age. Over a period of time and with the careful guidance of the case worker during this period, she has gained a degree of objectiveness. Two activities have taken place recently, the first of which is a deep interest in her younger sister now entering her teens. This interest is in effect an act of identifying herself with her sister because of the means it provides for vicariously entering into a missed adolescent group experience. The second is that of joining the Cadet Nurses, and she proudly displays her uniform to the case worker when in the office for a visit. Here again is a cult experience which means a great deal to her, as is evident from her remarks to the case worker.

On the basis of the fact that youth will seek a cult experience of some sort, what can a parish offer its youth?—and not only offer it, but also definitely relate it to the content of Christian faith and action. This enters, for one thing, into the field of religious education where some of the answers ought to be found. The remark of one religious educator, "We are by no means certain

that the traditional Sunday School is the answer to religious education," is a helpful confession.

The centering of religious education within the framework of the liturgy offers a clue, and is the plan followed by several parish priests. "Junior Churches" in which the instruction is done by the priest are along the same lines. How far this tends to unreflective acceptance of Christian doctrine is a fruitful field for discussion. There is a particular danger when the instruction is given from the chancel only, with little or no opportunity for further discussion in groups. Certainly teaching by the liturgy would have to be most carefully planned in order to relate it to the chronological needs of the various ages present. On the other hand, with all its possible faults, such a form of teaching by the priest will avoid the horrible results encountered by youth whose total Sunday School training by laymen leads them to believe that the essence of Christianity is "to try to be like Jesus"! In relation to this matter of instruction and opportunity for discussion, one case worker who previously worked with undergraduates as a student counsellor in a large mid-western university stated that the Episcopal students did not assume positions of leadership in religious activities in proportion to their leadership in other campus activities. There is not sufficient data to suggest a conclusion, but it indicates that there might well be a field here for further observation of some of the results of our present religious education.

Not only should the need for cult experience in youth be explored, but also how to establish as clearly as possible the *content* of Christian concepts. Members of a confirmation class were asked

to write out their idea of God, and the results were not too encouraging, ranging from sheer anthropomorphism to the confession, "I just never thought much about God, and I really don't know what I think." From case records come equally confused answers: "Yes, I pray; I *think* it is to God I pray, not my father. But he looks like my father." "Uh, uh, He's no good—I haven't been able to pray to Him since Rev. Mr. Blank told me at Christmas to think about Him as a baby and then I'd get to know Him. I don't need another *baby* to be sorry for—I need help." About her 13 year old sister: "You'd better ask her. If you ask me, I don't think she thinks about Him at all. She just takes Him for granted and gets the biggest kick out of going to church. I don't think it would be natural for her to talk about Him at her age." The 10 year old boy who in response to a question as to what he had learned in Sunday School: "Oh, the same old thing, God is love." An adolescent: "But what I'd like to know is this—if He's as good as all that, and really loves us, why do you have to ask Him to do these things for others? He must know they are sick. If He does and waits for someone else to ask Him before He helps, well, it's beyond me."

The fact that such vagueness, uncertainty and total absence of intellectual formulation of basic Christian doctrine exists among both the problem youth and those who have avoided major difficulties, reveals at least the need for adequate instruction in terms and symbols that can be visualized and comprehended, in order to be of any significant help in relating creed to code. Hero-stories and Christian social action discussions have their value; but sound religious education of youth cannot af-

ford to scratch the surface, and it calls for a coming to grips with the Christian creed in terms understandable to youth. It would appear to be difficult to teach creed through code, and remain true to Christian experience.

V. *Wherein can the clergy be of aid to Church social agencies in working with youth?*

All of the foregoing suggests four answers:

1. The clergy should examine the religious concepts of the individual and then give instruction on points that appear necessary: The nature of God, the value of personality, forgiveness, grace—in brief, the theological basis of conduct.
2. They should discover wherein a normal cult experience within the parish may have been denied or warped. In helping to provide such an experience after the individual has had a major difficulty, a warning is needed: Avoid placing pressure upon the individual, such as teaching in the Sunday School, in the belief that this will help the person to adjust or find himself. This may be sound in due time, but not as a step involved in the process of restoration.
3. Use should be made of the confessional, depending upon the individual's previous experience with it. And this raises the question: How many of the clergy follow through the confession by suggesting that the individual see *another* priest or a Christian psychiatrist or a case worker for further help *when there is a deeply rooted conflict apparent?*
4. Finally, as a matter of outstanding importance, experience with young people (and adults) makes it clear that

the parish priest is to do *his* job and *no other*. Some records of conversation cast light upon this: "In response to a question as to whether it might have upset her to be asked what her idea of God was when she was ill and was visited by a priest, she replied, 'No, I think he should have asked me. It would have started me to think, and I would have realized then that I didn't know anything about Him at all, and that I'd better learn. I had plenty of time to think.'" Again, after a priest had been asked to call upon a client of an agency: "Why is he shy?" asked the client; "it makes me think they don't believe what they say, or that we are so bad or so dumb they can't be bothered to tell us." Another record: "He isn't humble enough to be a minister. He talked the whole time how important it was to get the right people in the ministry and for a minister to choose the right wife." And repeated in diverse ways, in answer to the question whether boys and girls have told a clergyman a certain thing, comes the answer: "He didn't ask me" or, "I thought maybe I would shock him" or, "He didn't seem interested in what I told him."

Any discussion on this fifth question would indeed center upon the area in which a priest performs his legitimate duties, and the relation of his skills to those of others who may be called in by him to help. His referral of the person to others doesn't mean the relinquishment of his pastoral care, but rather an augmentation of it by another skill. Then too, it is relevant to recall the historic act of the apostles in appointing deacons to serve the tables. "We will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word"

(Acts 6:4). The first duty of the priest is here established, and to offer other forms of aid in place of the ministry of the word and of prayer may tend to confuse and weaken the parishioners' understanding of the office of the priest. It is not necessary to labor the point of the necessity of material aid at times; the warning is for the priest to see clearly *his own particular function as a priest*, and the relation of his office to other professional help.

This paper has not entered into a full discussion of the many points raised, for that is not its purpose. Rather it has been written in order to report certain findings, and to stimulate discussion of the facts reported. The authors hope that it will serve to strengthen the work of the Church with our youth in the areas of religious education and of counselling, and help in establishing a wider basis for co-operation between the clergy and those engaged in social work.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. To what extent have you found among young people a lack of understanding of the relation between the tenets of theology which they are taught and their personal conduct? Have you any method for discovering what the concept of God means to young people in your parish?
2. How may the cult expression of youth be guided by the Church or used by the Church? What kinds of young people appear to miss out on normal cult expression of youth; what effect does it have upon them, and what factors exist in the parish life to help them? What may be the dangers in cult expression?
3. In what areas have you as a priest co-operated with social workers and doctors? Have you encountered any basic differences of principle between their thinking and yours which have prohibited full co-operation on your part with them? What factors may stand between you and young people in your parish?

which tend to restrict their coming to you for help in personal problems? What factors exist to promote their confidence, and how may these be used?

ALTERNATIVE TOPICS

For those who wish to continue their discussion or reading on the material for the *Regional Congresses*, presented in the April 1945 syllabus, the following discussion topics are offered:

I. By her official creeds the Church has defined her doctrine of God; in what ways, other than in the Catechism's "Duty toward my neighbor," has the Church defined her concept of the laws which should govern society?

II. Has the Church the authority to judge society, or to propose principles for the correction of society as it is at present constituted? If so, upon what is this authority based? Has the Church any rule or test by which to judge man's attempts to apply "love of neighbor" to social conditions?

III. Is the rule of the Church applicable to all of society or only to her members? What should be the Church's attitude toward those who reject her interpretation of the principle of "love of neighbor"?

IV. Is the Church involved in the sins of society? If so, how far does this vitiate her capacity to judge society? Has the Church

capacity for self-judgment as to her involvement in the the sins of society?

V. Why do prominent Churchmen differ so sharply in their application of the principle, "love of neighbor," to society? Which attempt at application is right, and upon what is the judgment based?

VI. It has been proposed that "the Church should be represented at the Peace Table." If such representation is permitted, how is it to be obtained? Who could adequately "represent the Church"? To what extent are Christian statesmen representing the Church?

Suggestions for Reading and Study

Reinhold Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*.

P. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*.

William Temple, *The Church Looks Forward*.
Articles in *Christendom*, Winter 1945:

"Loyalty to the Church."

"The Spirit of God and the Corporate Guidance of the Church."

Hayek, *Road to Serfdom*.

Fast, *Freedom Road*.

Pastoral letters of the House of Bishops, especially "The Davenport Pastoral."

(This material, Alternative Topics, with Bibliography, has been prepared by the Rev. R. A. Cunningham of Hartford, Connecticut.)

THREE DOCUMENTS ON THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN SOUTH ARABIA

By ARTHUR JEFFERY

Columbia University

It is not yet possible to write the history of the planting and early spread of Christianity in South Arabia. It is not that there is a dearth of documents, but rather a lack of the right kind of documents such as would guide us to an understanding of how rightly to interpret and use those we already have. Most of our information as to the history of Arabia comes, of course, from the Muslim

chroniclers and antiquarians writing in Arabic. They have a great deal to say about South Arabia, and the older authorities, such as Caussin de Perceval, were inclined to follow them rather than the Greek writers who also dealt with South Arabian affairs. The discovery and interpretation of inscriptional material in the old South Arabian languages, however, has shown that the Greeks

spoke truly and that the Arabic accounts were largely legendary. For this reason the accounts of South Arabian Christianity in the Muslim Arabic sources, while they may contain elements of truth, and even preserve names of real people and reminiscences of things which really happened, yet must be used with extreme caution even after the obvious legendary accretions have been removed.

The information given in Christian Arabic writers is very meagre, and is often nothing but a repetition of what they found in Greek and Syriac sources. The ecclesiastical writers in Greek, Syriac, Ethiopic and Coptic, provide us with an abundance of isolated bits of information about the spread of Christianity in South Arabia and its fate there, but these bits are extremely difficult to fit together, and still more difficult to fit with what we learn from the Byzantine chroniclers, who themselves, indeed, are by no means in agreement in what they tell us about South Arabian affairs. The old Arabic poetry has been used by Louis Cheikho as a source; but the learned Jesuit's enthusiasm and imagination ran away with him in his *Christian Arabic Poets*, and all we can really garner from this old poetry is a collection of isolated references which, while they may be good independent evidence for the presence of Christianity at various points in that area, do not tell us very much. The geographers, whether Byzantine or Arab, tell us very little more than what they had themselves learned from the antiquarians, and in South Arabia it has not yet been possible to make even such surface archaeological investigations as have uncovered the ruins of numerous Christian monasteries, churches and settlements in North Arabia. Among the South Arabian inscriptions are some Christian inscriptions,

such as the famous Gl. 618 from the mound of Ma'rib which opens with an invocation to the Trinity, but so far the net result of gleanings from the inscriptions is meagre.

Thus the task of writing the history of Christianity in South Arabia is that of weaving together a great number of strands gathered from one source or another, never quite certain that some strands are really going to hold, and very conscious that there are great gaps where we have no strands at all to help fill out the picture.

There are, of course, legends of the Apostolic origin of Christianity in this region, of how Thomas stopped there for a while on his way to India, of how Bartholomew preached there before going on to his martyrdom in the land of the Parthians, and left there a Hebrew Gospel that was later found there by the Alexandrian catechist Pantaenus, who brought it back to Egypt, and of how the Ethiopian eunuch, besides his labours in Africa, preached also in Arabia Felix and on some islands in the Red Sea. All the early notices, however, labour under the confusion that in their days the word *India* was used to mean not only India proper, but also South Arabia and at times even Abyssinia and the neighbouring coasts, so that we are never quite sure to what area these Apostolic legends refer.

The other accounts of the planting of Christianity in these regions agree only in the suggestion that it was of lay origin and not the result of planned ecclesiastical endeavour. Arabic sources both Muslim and Christian tell of its planting there by slaves who were sold to South Arabian masters and who introduced their faith among those with whom they had newly come to dwell. Greek and

Syriac sources suggest that it was founded there by merchants who were either born in Christian communities abroad, or had learned the Christian faith while in foreign centres of trade and brought it back with them to South Arabia, where later it became important enough to need ecclesiastical supervision.

We really reach something tangible, however, only when we come to the great persecutions of the sixth century. The Martyrdom of the Christians of Najrān is celebrated in the Roman Martyrology on the 24th of October; in the Jacobite Menologies on December 31st; in the Arabic Feasts of the Melkites on October 2nd; in the Armenian Synaxarium on the 20th of October, and in the Ethiopian Senkesar on November 22nd, so that it was an event of some notoriety. The Arabic chroniclers know that the invasion of South Arabia by the Abyssinians, which put an end to the old Tubba' dynasty, was brought about as a consequence of the persecution of the Christians, and they have long accounts of the deeds of one Dhū Nuwās, a local ruler who had become a Jew and whose massacre of the Christians was notorious, and which may even be referred to in the Qur'ān LXXXV, 4 ff. It was this persecution that led to Abyssinian overlordship in South Arabia, an overlordship that was associated in Muslim legend with the famous Year of the Elephant, the year in which tradition says Muḥammad was born. The legend is clear evidence of the fact that the Abyssinian suzerainty was Christian, for the reason for the great expedition against Mecca, with which the legend of the Year of the Elephant deals, was to mete out chastisement on the city for a desecration committed by two Meccans on the new Christian church the Abyssinian viceroy

had just completed at San'a. A later native rising against the Abyssinians brought the Persians into the country, invited by the native princes to help them against the Abyssinians, but remaining to rule, and that struggle so weakened the country that the Muslim conquest, even in the lifetime of the Prophet, was an easy matter. When the Caliph 'Umar in 635 compelled the Jews and Christians of Najrān to emigrate to Mesopotamia and take up new lands there, the fate of Christianity in South Arabia was sealed.

The history of Christianity in South Arabia was thus not a long one, but it had apparently a vigorous life, and though short was yet long enough to seal its faith by martyrdom and so have a place in the remembrance of the Church universal. The story of that martyrdom was brought vividly to mind in 1924 when Axel Moberg published some Syriac fragments that had been rescued from the binding of an old Syriac liturgical MS, and which proved to be odds and ends of a *Book of the Himyarites*, which once contained the full story of that martyrdom. This, however, is only one document, and as the documents dealing with this brief history of Christianity in South Arabia have an interest in themselves, and deserve to be known to a wider group than the very small circle of Orientalists who have access to them at present, three of them have been selected as typical examples.

The first consists of the two divergent traditions on the introduction of Christianity into Najrān, taken from the Muslim Arabic sources. The selection here is from the *Sīrat an-Nabī* of Ibn Hishām (†834). It is the earliest extant Life of the Prophet Muḥammad, and is based on the earlier Life of one Ibn Ishāq (†c. 768), which he frequently quotes in

extenso. In the early part of this work the author gives some account of the condition of affairs in Arabia before the coming of Muḥammad, and is at pains to explain the presence of Jewish and Christian communities in the peninsula. The stories of Phemion and Ibn ath-Thāmir are on pp. 20-25 of Wüstenfeld's edition of the text. The legends have been studied by Axel Moberg in his *Über einige christliche Legenden in der islamischen Tradition*, Lund, 1930.

The second is an Abyssinian legend of the planting of Christianity, which some have thought connected with the above Arabic story of Phemion, and which certainly has been translated into Ethiopic from some Arabic source. Conti Rossini published the Ethiopic text of *Acta Azqir* from a MS in the British Museum and one in the d'Abbadie collection, in Tome XIX of the *Rendiconti dell' Accademia dei Lincei*, Roma, 1910. In its present form it cannot be earlier than the XIVth Cent. but as the martyr Azqir is commemorated in the Ethiopian Synaxarium on the 24th Ḥedar, the legend may be fairly old.

The third is the famous letter of Simeon of Beth Arsham over which so much controversy has raged since Assemani first published the text in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. The text used here is that published by Ign. Guidi in 1881 in Vol. VII of the *Memorie della R. Accademia dei Lincei*. Its authenticity was denied by J. H. Mordtmann in the *ZDMG* for 1881, in his discussion "Die himjarisch-äthiopischen Kriege noch einmal," and Halévy impugned its genuineness in his articles in the *Revue des Études juives* for 1889, where he tried to prove that the persecutors in South Arabia were not the Jews but the Arians. Curiously enough both Duchesne and D. S. Margoliouth have

been willing to give up the genuineness of the letter, though that has been strongly defended by both Dillmann and Nöldeke, who have more right to be heard on such a question. The genuineness of the letter, of course, only means that the letter was written by Simeon of Beth Arsham in much the form in which we have it, but does not guarantee that all that Simeon tells of in the letter actually happened as he describes it. Simeon was the monophysite Bishop of Beth Arsham, who preached the monophysite doctrine at al-Ḥīra, the capital of the Lakhmid kingdom, which perhaps explains why he was part of an embassy from Justin II to the Lakhmid king al-Mundhir III, and so was there when the news of the massacres at Najrān reached the Lakhmid court. Halévy in his articles in the *Revue des Études Juives* laboured hard to prove that the persecutions were not at the hands of Jews, but there are numerous odd pieces of evidence to show that there was some sort of Jewish hegemony there at the time, and the documents from one point of view are rather interesting as documents of anti-Semitism, showing the sort of things that were being said and the arguments used in that sad business in the sixth century. However, it is as documents illustrating the stories that were circulating in that century as to the history of Christianity in South Arabia that they are presented here.

IBN HISHĀM ON PHEMION

(ed. Wüstenfeld, pp. 20-22)

Now in Nejrān there were adherents of the people of the religion of Jesus the son of Mary, who followed the Gospel, a kindly and upright people as are the people of their faith. They had a chief

named 'Abdallah b. ath-Thāmir. The place where that religion first took root was Najrān, which was the centre of the Arab country at that time. Its people, like the rest of the Arabs, worshipped idols, and the reason for Christianity starting there was that a man of the Christian faith, named Phemion, settled among them and led them to his religion, which they adopted.

Said Ibn Ishāq: Al-Mughīra b. Abī Labīd, the client of al-Akhnas, related to me from Wahb b. Munabbih the Yeminite, that the story of the coming of that religion to Najrān, was that a man of the adherents of the religion of Jesus the Son of Mary (upon whom be peace) named Phemion, who was a pious, earnest, unworldly man, whose prayers God heard, used to wander about from village to village, never staying long enough to be well-known in one village ere he set off to another where he was not known. He was a builder and bricklayer, and never ate save what he earned by his own labours. He used to honour the Lord's day, for when it was the Lord's day he would not labour, but would go out into the open places to pray until evening came.

He was in one of the villages of Syria working in his unobtrusive way when he caught the interest of a man of the place named Šāliḥ. This Šāliḥ conceived such an affection for him as none before him ever had, and used to follow him wherever he went, though Phemion took no notice of him, till one Lord's day he went out into the open spaces as was his wont, and Šāliḥ followed him without Phemion being aware of it. Šāliḥ sat down within sight of him, but concealed from him, not wishing him to know where he was. Then Phemion rose up and prayed, and while he was praying there

drew near him a *tinnīn*, that snake which hath seven heads. When Phemion saw it he cursed it and it died. Šāliḥ saw this snake, and not knowing what had happened to it, he feared what it might do to Phemion, so he began to lament and cry out, "O Phemion, the *tinnīn*! it is coming after you." But he did not turn round, but went on with his prayers till he finished them. Then evening came and he departed. But he knew now that he was taken notice of, and Šāliḥ knew that he had seen his spying-place. So he said to him, "O Phemion, you know that I have never loved anyone as I love you. I desire your companionship and to be with you wherever you are." Phemion answered, "As you will. My condition is as you see, so if you think you can bear it, well and good." So Šāliḥ followed him.

Then the people of that village also began to take notice of him, so that when he returned home any slave who had sickness would come to him and he would pray for him, and he would find relief, but if he were summoned to anyone in sickness he would not go to him. Now there was a man in that village who had a son who was sick. He asked about Phemion, and was told that he never came to anyone who summoned him, but that he laboured for daily wage as a builder. So the man went to his son and laid him in a room and put a cover over him. Then he went to Phemion and said, "O Phemion, I have some work that needs doing at my house, so come along with me that you may see it and I will strike a bargain with you about it." So he went along with him till they reached and entered the room. Said Phemion, "Well, what do you want me to do for your house?" He said, "Thus and thus." Then the man pulled the cover from off his son and said, "O Phemion,

this is a servant of God to whom has befallen what thou seest, so pray to God for him." Then Phemion prayed for him, and the youth rose up whole.

But Phemion knew that he had become known, so he departed from the village, and Ṣāliḥ followed him. Now while he was journeying along in a part of Syria he passed by a very ancient tree, when a man called to him, "O, Phemion!" "Yes," answered he. Said the man, "Long have I been looking for you and saying, Will he never come? Then I heard your voice and knew that you were he. Do not leave this place till you have attended to me, for I am about to die." Straightway he died, so he attended to him and buried him, and then moved on. Ṣāliḥ continued following him till they set foot in a certain territory of the Arabs, who fell upon them. Afterwards a caravan of some Arabs took them and carried them off and sold them in Najrān. At that time the people of Najrān followed the religion of the ancient Arabs, worshipping a tall date-palm they had there, for which also they had an annual festival when they hung upon it the finest garments they could find, and female ornaments. Then they would come and dance around it the whole day.

Phemion was bought by one of the nobles, another of whom bought Ṣāliḥ. Now when Phemion rose up by night to pray in the house in which his master had set him to dwell, it shone brightly for him till morning came, so that he had no need of a lamp. His master noticed this and was amazed at what he saw, so he asked him about his religion. Then Phemion told him and said to him, "But you people are in error; this palm tree neither harms anyone, nor does it benefit them, and were I to curse it, my God whom I worship, would destroy it, for He is God

alone Who has no partner." Said his master, "Then do it, and if you succeed we will enter your religion and abandon ours." So Phemion arose and purified himself and prayed a two-bow prayer, and called down God's curse upon it. Then God Almighty sent a wind which tore it up by the roots and cast it away. Thereupon the people of Najrān embraced his religion, and he brought them over to the religious law of the religion of Jesus the Son of Mary. Afterwards there entered among them those innovations which came among people of their faith all over the earth. Thus was the origin of Christianity in Najrān in the land of the Arabs.

Said Ibn Ishāq: "This is the narrative of Wahb b. Munabbih, which he got from the people of Najrān."

ANOTHER ACCOUNT OF THE INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY INTO NAJRĀN

(Ibn Hishām, ed. Wüstenfeld, pp. 23-24)

This story is now connected with the name of Phemion, though obviously it had originally no connection with his story. The connection is probably due to Ibn Ishāq himself.

Said Ibn Ishāq: Yazid b. Ziyād related to me from Mḥd b. Ka'b al Qurazī an account which I heard also from certain people of Najrān, who had heard it from their forefathers, how that the people of Najrān were polytheists, worshipping idols. In one of the villages near Najrān, for Najrān itself was the capital city of that country, there was a magician, who taught occult arts to the youth of Najrān. When Phemion came there (the story of Ibn Munabbih does not name him, but says—"a man came there"), he set up a tent between Najrān and that village where dwelt the magician, to whom the people of Najrān used to send their

youths to learn occult arts. Now it came to pass that ath-Thāmir sent his son 'Abdallah along with the youths of Najrān, and as he passed the owner of that tent he was astonished at what he saw of his prayers and his worship. So he began to take his seat near him and listen to him, which resulted in his conversion, so that he turned his face to God and worshipped Him. Then he began to ask (Phemion) about the religious law of this faith, and when he was well instructed therein, began to ask him about the mightiest names of God. But though Phemion knew this he concealed it from him, saying, "My child, you could not bear it; I fear you are too weak for it."

Ath-Thāmir, 'Abdallah's father, had no idea that his son was not going to the magician like the other youths. When 'Abdallah saw that his friend kept this knowledge from him and feared his weakness, he went and got some divining arrows, and wrote on these arrows all the names of God that he knew, for every name one arrow till he finished the number. Then he lit a fire for them and began to throw them in, arrow after arrow until he came to the arrow on which was the mightiest name of God. He threw this arrow in but it leaped out without harming him. So he took this arrow and went to his friend (Phemion) and told him that he now knew the name which he had kept from him. Said he, "And what is it?" He said, "It is such and such." Said (Phemion), "And how did you learn it?" Then he told him what he had done, and (Phemion) said, "My child, you have obtained it, but keep yourself under control, a thing which I am afraid that you will not do."

Then 'Abdallah went back to Najrān, and never did he meet anyone in distress but he would say to him, "Servant of

God, will you admit the unity of God and join my religion? Then will I pray to God for you and He will relieve you from all the trouble you are in." He would say, "Surely," and would confess the unity and be converted, whereupon 'Abdallah would pray for him and he would be relieved. This went on till there remained not in Najrān anyone in trouble or distress who had not come to him and submitted to his command that he might pray for him for relief. Then the king of Najrān heard of him and commanded him to come to him, and said, "You have turned against me the people of my city and have transgressed against my religion and the religion of my fathers, so I shall make an example of you." Said ('Abdallah), "But you cannot do that." Then the king had him taken to a high mountain and cast down head first, but he reached the ground unharmed. Then the king sent him to a pool they had in Najrān wherein everything that fell perished, and had him cast therein, but he came out unharmed. When he had brought him to the end of his resources, 'Abdallah said to him, "You will never be able to kill me till you confess the unity of God and believe in what I believe. If you do that you will have power over me and be able to kill me." Thereupon the king proclaimed the unity and confessed the faith of 'Abdallah b. ath-Thāmir. Then he struck him with a stick that was in his hand and fractured his skull a little so that he died. But the king perished at the same moment.

Thus did the people of Najrān agree upon accepting the religion of 'Abdallah b. ath-Thāmir, and it was then just as Jesus gave it in the Gospel and as He ordained. Later there affected them also those corruptions that affected all

the people of this religion. Such was the origin of Christianity in Najrān.

THE ACTS OF AZQĪR

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, one sole God. The spiritual conflict and martyrdom of the holy martyr Azqīr, priest of Najrān, who was the first teacher of the Christians in the city of Najrān, and who spread the Christian religion in the time of Sarābhīl Dānkēf, king of Ḥamēr. He set up a tent for an oratory, and set up a cross. Learning of this the chief people of the city of Najrān of the She'ebān and the Qēfān, sent men who threw down the tent which was his oratory, broke the cross, arrested the holy Azqīr, and cast him into prison in darkness. This cavern was called Qafnāyt. While he was in prison there came those men whom he had instructed before being imprisoned, whom he had made neophytes, and who now came to seek baptism. The holy Azqīr said to the guards of the prison, "Open to these men," but the guards of the prison refused to open. Then the holy Azqīr rose to his feet and prayed, saying, "O my Lord, Jesus Christ, Who didst open the iron gate for Peter and loosed his bonds, do Thou order for these that the door stand open all night, and close not till Thy servants have entered and have received Thy grace." The door then opened of itself by the power of the Lord, and those men to the number of fifty entered. The prison guards rose up to shut the door, but they were afraid, and they were about fifty. The prison guards did not succeed in shutting the door to hinder anyone from entering in to the holy Azqīr. Then the prison guards recognized that such a miracle was from the Lord, and being afraid they

fled, abandoning their post. So those fifty men entered in to the holy Azqīr, who made a pool in the prison and baptized them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, so that those men received baptism that night. The Saint led prayers, and there appeared to them full light within the prison. So it was, and this was the first miracle that the holy Azqīr did, being in prison.

I

The king Sarābhēl was annoyed by what the holy Azqīr had done, and the king sent a messenger to the chiefs who were in Najrān, saying, "Bring quickly that man who has introduced a new religion into my country." Then there ran to the holy Azqīr, as he was in prison, a man named Kiryāq, who spoke and said, "I am come to give you good news, because the king of Ḥamēr has sent a message regarding you, for which reason they will take you to him for martyrdom." The holy Azqīr said to this man, "Truly, yours is good news, and this good news of yours will be at my expense" (i.e. for me to reward). The inhabitants of the city came and spoke to the holy Azqīr, brought him out of the prison, and bound him with that man who had held discourse with the holy Azqīr. At that moment there arrived many merchants from Tonāḥ, with whom they sent the Saint to the king of Ḥamēr. As they went out from Najrān many people followed him, accompanying him as far as the place called Wādḥo, about fifteen furlongs from the city of Najrān. Arrived there, two men besought him to baptize them, so he made there a place of prayer, near a rock, caused water to flow, and there baptized them that day. Although there was no water in that place

it flowed at the prayer of the holy Azqîr and still flows to this day. The place where the water flowed is precipitous. When he who was bound with him saw this prodigy, he begged of him, saying, "Remember, O my lord, that it was I who spoke to you when you were in prison, and you said to me, 'At my expense is thy good news.' Fulfil now the promise of what you were going to give me for my good news. I desire not, indeed, gold or silver, or any such thing; but baptize me, and that will be my recompense for my good news." The holy Azqîr thanked the Lord for this man, and straightway baptized him.

II

Passing beyond that place, as they proceeded they came to the desert called Gaw'ân. As it says in the Book, "My soul had thirst in the desert land, where there was neither tree nor water," so in that land there was neither tree nor water. Gaw'ân in Arabic signifies "hunger." When they arrived in that place there came all the travellers, and found themselves in great tribulation, both they and their beasts, on the day of that dry stage. So they begged the holy Azqîr and besought him, saying, "Pray the Lord for us, to everyone's advantage, that we die not of thirst. For we know well that whatever thou dost ask the Lord He will grant thee." Said the holy Azqîr, "Give me a drinking-trough." So they brought him a drinking-trough. Then he separated himself from them, placed the drinking-trough in front of him, stretched out his hands, raised his hands to the heavens and prayed, saying, "O my Lord Jesus Christ, who hast created the heavens and set them as a vault; who didst change the water into wine, and didst satisfy a great multitude

with five loaves, work now a miracle. Send Thy mercy and quench the thirsty soul." Then a cloud came down on the drinking-trough to the height of a man's palm, and the drinking-trough was filled with water. Men and beasts drank, quenched their thirst, and furnished themselves for the voyage. The number of men who drank from that water was more than six hundred, besides the beasts. That drinking-trough still exists today in Tonâh, in the house of a spiritual descendant of Azqîr. This is the third miracle wrought by the holy Azqîr in the name of God, after his imprisonment.

III

Passing beyond there they came to Şefâr, to the king of Ḥamêr. They made him enter to the king, but as he entered he made no salutation. The king looked at him with supreme disdain, and said to the holy Azqîr, "What is this new religion that you have introduced into my country?" The holy Azqîr said to him, "But this is not a new religion, for indeed, the Prophets and the Pentateuch foretold it." Then he began to discuss with the Jews, basing himself on the Holy Scriptures. Said the king to him, "What does it profit you, O Azqîr, to go into all this question? Think rather of yourself and of your life in this world, since Christ in whom you have believed will not avail you. So take heed lest I inflict on you a great and terrible punishment." The holy Azqîr answered him, "Life in this world is death, and your condemnation to death, which is in your hand, to us is life." Then the king began to tempt him with riches, but the holy Azqîr said to him, "Gold and silver are but ephemeral, whereas Christ will abide for ever." After this one of the Rabbis rose and said

to the king, "My Lord, these Christians have a magic beverage which they make men drink. If one spits it out directly, he may deny Christ, but if it enters anyone's marrow he will never deny Christ for ever; prolong no further discussion with him, but send him back to his country and to his Christian companions, that he may be judged in Najrān, where his own people may see and fear." The king granted this request and wrote to the chiefs who were in Najrān, the She'ebān and the Qēfān. He sent the holy Azqīr to Najrān and wrote as follows, "When Azqīr is come to you, let him not be executed in secret, but publicly. Attach him to a stake; pile around it wood, and keep it burning so long as he is still alive." The holy Azqīr went out from the king as one rejoicing, having heard how the king had written that he be suspended and burned with fire for Christ's sake. Back in Najrān he taught and made converts to Christianity. At break of day they led him without the city, planted there a stake, and suspended him thereon. Then they brought much wood of palm branches, and lay them close together against him. A Jew said, "Let Christ come and save you who have trusted in Him, if He is able." Said the holy Azqīr, "I have put my trust in the Lord, in my Lord Jesus Christ. Were fire set to all the wood in your country laid against me, it would avail naught against me." Then they lit the fire against him, and it burned up all the wood and the cords with which they had bound his hands and feet, but the holy Azqīr descended from the stake and stood in the midst of the fire like gold purified. The Jews said, "This man who has vanquished the fire is a sorcerer and magician." They also said, "Leave him. We will stone him with stones."

IV

There was a Jew there with his wife and his sons. Having put on festal attire they had come out to take part in the death of the holy martyr Azqīr. He and his wife were the first of all to hurl stones at the holy Azqīr. The stone did not reach the holy Azqīr, but the little son died before his father's eyes, even though his father was protecting him. His stomach split and he died. Also his wife, while still alive, was devoured by worms. The Jews said among themselves, "Come now, let us beat him with sticks." One of them said, "How long will you put up with this man? Come along now, let us make enquiry and prepare a sword with which we shall kill him." And they found a Najrānite whom the same holy Azqīr had before converted to Christianity, and this man carried a sword. They begged of him to lend it to them, but he refused to lend it. But the holy Azqīr desired to end his spiritual combat, and said to the disciple, "My son, lend your sword. If you lend it not you will have no share and common heritage with me." So straightway he gave his sword to a Jew. The holy Azqīr stretched forth his neck, and the Jew struck with the sword and severed the head of the holy priestly martyr Azqīr. Many miracles were worked at his tomb. May his prayers be with us for ever and ever. Amen.

Moreover others had the crown of martyrdom also. They flinched not, but gave themselves to the fire as a sacrifice for love of the name of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ, to receive the crown of martyrdom, disdaining the world. In the territory of Najrān there received the crown of martyrdom metropolitans, priests, deacons, monks, men

and women, and many people together, and were judged. The number of those who were killed was thirty eight. Their commemoration is on the 24th day of the month of Ḥedār in Greece. To us be their prayers, and may we have share in the reign and the heritage of all the saints and martyrs, in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, to Whom be praise and glory, majesty and power, and of His Father, together with Him and the Holy Ghost, the giver of life, the celestial one, now and always, throughout all the ages. Amen and Amen.

LETTER GIVING AN ACCOUNT OF THE HIMYARITE MARTYRS

By Simeon, Bishop of the Persian
Christians; sent from Ḥirta de
Bēth Nu'mān

We would have you know, beloved, that on the 20th of Second Kanun of this present year 835 of Alexander (i.e. January, 524 A.D.), we went out from Ḥirta de Nu'mān with the most excellent Mar Abraham, the priest, son of Euphrasios, who had been sent from Justinian, King of the Romans, to Mundhir, King of Ḥirta, to make peace with the Romans. About him we have already written in our previous letter, for we and all the faithful who are with us are in receipt of his goodness, for in everything he is assisting our part of the faithful, and he knows well what formerly we wrote and what we now are writing.

When we had journeyed in the desert towards the south and the east a journey of ten days, we overtook King Mundhir, over against the mountains called the Sand Mountains, in the tongue of the Arabs of the place called Ramleh. When we came into the camp of Mundhir there advanced to meet us the pagan Arabs and

the Ma'adites, saying to us, "What is there then for you to do from now on, since your Christ has been expelled by the Romans, the Persians and the Himyarites, and from all lands?" And when with these and the like reproaches Mar Abraham the priest was reproached, and we also with him, by the pagan Arabs and Ma'adites, great sorrow came upon us, and it was a great affliction for all true believers. As we approached there came a messenger from the King of the Himyarites to Mundhir King of Ḥirta, having a letter full of vaunting, in which he told him what evil things he had done to the Christians of Najrān, the Himyarite city. And thus did he write to him:

That king whom the Cushites set up in our land is dead; and the winter season having arrived the Cushites are not able to come across to our land, so I have taken the rule over all the land of the Himyarites, and before all else, this I intend to do: all the Christians will I exterminate from the whole land of the Himyarites, unless they deny Christ and become Jews like us. First, all the Cushites who were left in our country to guard the church which they hoped they had built for themselves in our land, I was able to unsettle, and laid hold on them and killed them all, 280 men, both clerics and laymen. And that church of theirs I made into one of our synagogues. After this I led 120,000 troops with me, and went to the city of Najrān, and besieged it for not a few days. But when I saw that it was not soon subdued, I gave them the word of an oath that they should suffer no evil if they surrendered to me their city of their own accord. By this they were brought into subjection and opened the gates of the city, and all their leaders came out unto me. But it

did not seem to me right to keep troth with Christians, so I demanded of them first that they bring me their gold and their silver and all their substance, and when they had brought it to me, and I had taken it from them, I demanded of them that they show me Paul, their Bishop. He, they told me, was dead, but I did not believe them till they showed me his tomb. His bones I took and burned with fire. I burned also their church and their priests, and all that was found therein. After this I demanded of them that they deny Christ and the cross and become Jews like us, but they were not willing. Then I said to them, "Lo! now the Romans recognize that Christ was a man, why do you go astray after Him? Ye, surely, are not better than the Romans?" And we said to them, "We are not demanding of you that you deny God, the maker of heaven and earth, nor that you worship the sun or the moon or other luminous bodies, or any other creature, but that you deny Jesus, He who considered Himself as God, and say only that He is man and not God." And with many such (words) we distressed them, but they were not willing to deny Christ, nor were they willing to say that He was man; but in their foolishness they were saying, "He is God, and the Son of the Merciful." And they elected to die for Him. Their leader, moreover, spoke much against us, and as he deserved so was he recompensed, and all their chief men were killed. Then the remainder fled and hid themselves. These we have not yet come upon, but we have given command that all, wherever they are found, are to be put to death, unless they deny Christ and become Jews like us.

After this we brought out their women-folk and said to them, "Lo! ye have seen

with your eyes that your men, because they blasphemed and said that Christ was God and was the Son of Adonai, have all been killed. But do ye now spare yourselves and your sons and your daughters by denying Christ and His cross, and become Jewesses like us, and ye shall live, but if not ye shall surely die." But these women, more even than their husbands, were blaspheming and saying, "Christ is God, and the Son of the Merciful. In Him do we believe, the cross do we adore, and for Him will we die. Far be it from us that we should deny Him, or that we should survive our husbands. With them and like them we will die for Christ." We demanded of them that they confess that Christ was man, and live; but they would not so say, and chose for themselves death for the sake of the deceiver and sorcerer.

Moreover those women among them who are called the religious we saw disputing with those whose husbands had been put to death and who were saying, "It is right that we should die first after our husbands," for they were running and contending with one another who should die first. But we, when we heard their striving and saw them contending with one another as to whom of them should die first, laughed at their madness, such that they went astray after a man who had the audacity blasphemously to pretend that He Himself was God. And we were amazed that even the children, whom we supposed would not know anything about it, had been brought up in that error. So when we saw that they were thus in their foolishness striving with one another (for the honour of martyrdom), we gave command that all these women be put to death. One of them, however, because of her noble birth, her lineage and her beauty, we

were hoping would perhaps spare herself and her daughters, and be persuaded to deny Christ, so we gave command that she be not killed. Thus she came into the city, grieving that she had not died.

On the third day we sent for her (telling her) that if she would deny Christ she should live, but if not she should die. But she, when she heard this word, ran out into the market place in the middle of the city, although, as we have heard of her, she was a woman whose face no man had at any time seen, nor had she ever gone out in the daytime into the city until that day in which she stood in the city with uncovered head. And, as those who were there tell me, she cried aloud, saying, "Women of Najrān, my comrades, Christians, Jews and pagans, hearken. Ye know me, how that I am a Christian, and ye know my lineage and family, of whom I am and whose daughter I am, and that I have gold and silver and slaves and maid servants and fields and produce, and that I lack nothing. And now my husband has been killed for Christ's sake, and if I desired another husband, a husband for me would not be lacking. But here I am saying to you that on this very day I possess 40,000 stamped darics stored up in my treasury apart from the treasury of my husband, and apart from gold and silver and jewels and pearls and jacinths for my adornment. These things there are women among you who have seen in my house. And ye, my comrades, know that a woman has no happier days than the days of her marriage feast. From then onward are anxieties and sighings, the bearing of children in anguish and the suckling of them. And when she is deprived of children she is in grief and sorrow, and when she buries sons she buries them in weeping and lamentation.

But I, from today on, am free from all these things. In the days of my first marriage feast I was joyful; and my virgin daughters who have no husband I have adorned for the Christ. Rejoice with me, O my comrades, for twice have ye seen my face: on my first marriage feast, and now this second time. At that time with unveiled face before you all I went to my first spouse; now with unveiled face I go to Christ my Lord, my God and the God of my daughters, like as He came to us. Rejoice with me, my comrades; rejoice with me and with my daughters, that I am not less beautiful than you, and with it I go to Christ my Lord, unspoiled by Jewish unbelief. This beauty of mine will be for me a witness before my Lord, that he was not able to lead me astray into the sinfulness of unbelief in Christ. My gold and my silver, and all the jewels that are my adornment, my slaves and my maid-servants, and all that I have, shall be a testimony for me, that not for love of them have I denied Christ my Lord. And now the king has sent for me to deny Christ and live; but I have sent to him (saying) that were I to deny Christ I should die, but if I die for Christ's sake I shall live. Far be it from me, O my comrades, far be it from me to deny Christ my God, He in whom I have believed, and in whose name I was baptized and had my daughters baptized, whose cross I adore, and for whose sake I die, I and my daughters, as He died for us. Earthly gold I leave to the earth. Whosoever wishes to take my gold, let him take it; and whosoever wishes to take my silver and the jewels of my adornment, let him take (them), for I have abandoned everything that I may go to take from Christ my Lord its recompense. Blessed are ye, O my comrades,

if ye hearken to my words. Blessed are ye, O my comrades, if ye know the truth for which I and my daughters die. Blessed are ye, if ye love Christ. Blessed am I; blessed am I and my daughters, who are going to this blessedness. Henceforth peace and tranquillity will be with the peoples of Christ. The blood of these my brothers and sisters, who were slain for Christ's sake, will be a rampart to this city, if it remains faithful to Christ my Lord. Behold, with uncovered face I am going from this city in which I was as in a temporary dwelling, but I am going with my daughters to another city, that there I may betroth them. Pray for me, my comrades, that Christ my Lord, may receive me, and pardon me that I have been living these three days after the father of my daughters."

Then we heard a voice of lamentation from the city, such that we were all disturbed, for we did not know why the women were lamenting. But when the men came whom we had sent, and told us that all these things (above) related had raised an audacious uproar before the entire city, and that on account of this the women were lamenting, we were desirous of putting them to death for having permitted her to speak all this discourse and to stir up the city with her enchantments. After this she appeared in the city with uncovered head like an insane person, with her daughters, and came and stood before me with uncovered face, unashamed and holding her daughters with her hands, adorned as for a marriage festival. Then she loosed the tresses of her hair and wound them in her hand, raised her neck and stretched forth her throat with her head bowed before me saying, "A Christian am I, and so are my daughters. For Christ do we die.

Cut off our heads, that we may go and overtake our brothers and our sisters, and the father of my daughters." But I, after all this foolishness, again urged her and incited her to deny Christ, and say only that He is a man, but she was not willing to say it. One of her daughters, indeed, waxing bold, had the audacity to insult us when she heard us asking her mother to deny Christ. When I saw that there was no chance of her denying Christ, I gave orders, in order to terrify all the Christians, and she was thrown to the ground. Then we commanded that her daughters be slain and their blood poured into her mouth, after which her own head would be cut off. Thus did we deal with her. Afterwards I commanded that she be raised from the ground, and I asked her how the blood of her daughters tasted. But she in her foolishness swore by that came deceiver, "Like to a pure sacrifice, without blemish, thus was I tasting in my mouth and in my soul." Then we gave command and her head was struck off. But I swear by Adonai, King of Israel, that I grieved much because of her beauty and that of her daughters, and greatly did I wonder at her foolishness, and how she went astray after a man, a sorcerer and deceiver, who had had the audacity to blaspheme and give Himself out as God, and that she did not spare either herself or her daughters.

As for the sons and daughters of those who had been killed, it seemed good to our chief priests and to us to deal with them according as is written in the Law, that the son shall not be recompensed for the sins of the father. So we gave commandment that the children be left until they reached full age. Then if they denied Christ and became Jews they should live, but if not they also should be

put to death. So we divided them among our chiefs.

These things have we written to your Majesty, that you may rejoice that we have not left a Christian, not one, in this land of ours, and that you also may act likewise, that all the Christians who are in your dominions you may make followers of your religion, as we have done in our dominion; but as for the Jews who are in your dominion that you be their helper in everything, and whatever is needed in your dominion in return for this, send to us that we may dispatch it to you.

All these things the king of the Himyarites wrote to Mundhir king of Ḥirta just as we came to him in the desert with the excellent Mar Abraham the priest, son of Euphrasios, of whom we have spoken above, who was sent from Justin the king, with the reverend and venerable Mar Sergius, Bishop of Bēth Rūsāfā, to make peace between the Persian Arabs and the Romans. Now when these things thus written were read before Mundhir of Ḥirta, and before many—and there were many other things that the legate of the Himyarites said in mockery, laughing at and deriding the Christians and exulting, for these things that the king of the Himyarites spitefully did against the blessed martyrs and against the noble dame Dūmā and her daughters, all this the king of the Himyarites did not write in his letter, but the legate told these things to the king—before Jews and pagans. Then was there great sorrow to all the Christians, and joy to the pagans and the Jews. And these things have we written from (what was in) the letter to Mundhir, and from the words of the legate.

Now after the reading of this letter, which had been sent from the king of the

Himyarites, before Mundhir king of Ḥirta, (recounting) how the Christians there had been killed, and how persecution and great affliction had come upon them for the name of Christ, Mundhir the king waxed wroth, and in derision and scorning he cried out to all the Christian people of repute who were under his dominion, and said unto them, "Pay heed, ye Christians, to what I have said to you, and ye did not hearken, for I told you to forsake Christ, but ye were not willing. So forsake now the religion of Christ. Ye have already heard what happened to those who did not deny Christ, how the king of the Himyarites killed and destroyed them, and also burned their church. See how Christ has been rejected by Himyarites, Persians and Romans. Do ye not assent to forsake Christ? I am not better than the kings of the Persians and the Romans who have driven away and put out the Christians, nor than the king of the Himyarites, who has killed and exterminated them from his land. Pay heed to what I have said to you. But ye are not hearkening to me, nor are ye rejecting Christ."

When king Mundhir had said these things before all his grandees, one of his grandees, a Christian, moved by great zeal, rose, and with great courage said to the king, "It is not fitting that thou speak thus, O king. It was not in thy time that we became Christians, that thou shouldest counsel us to reject Christ and deny our Christianity. We, indeed, are Christians, but so were our fathers and the fathers of our fathers." Then the king was moved to anger against him, and said to him, "Has thou made bold to speak before me?" Then that grandee, who was a believer, answered and said before the king, "On behalf of

the religion of God am I speaking, and I am not afraid; nor is any man able to hinder me, for my sword is not shorter than that of another. For the religion of God do I stand until death, and will fight, and I am not fearful." Then when king Mundhir saw his courage, and how he fearlessly spake before him, he was unable to say any more against him, because of his family, and because of his recognition, for he was a great man in the world, and one of the head men of Ḥirta.

When we came to Ḥirta de Nu'mān on the Monday of the first week of Lent, we learned some things that were not written in the letter to Mundhir, for certain Himyarite believers, with a Christian ambassador who had been sent to king Mundhir from that Christian ruler whom the Cushites had set up to rule in the land of the Himyarites, when they were in Ḥirta de Nu'mān, heard of the death of that Christian ruler who had sent them. Wherefore they hired a man from Ḥirta and sent him to Najrān to see and find out the truth and bring them word from Najrān. So this man went and brought word thus. When the king had given the Najrānites an oath, and they had opened the gates of the city and come out to receive him and surrender the city to him, he was false to his oath, took their gold and their silver, burned the bones of the Bishop with fire, and burned the church with the monks and the people and all that was found in it. Next they brought all the chief people before him, to the number of 340 men, and he began to speak threateningly to the great and illustrious Ḥārith b. Ka'b, who was their chief (saying), "Why did you desire to revolt against me and rely on that sorcerer and deceiver? Did you think that you would escape from my

hands? But now spare your old age and deny that deceiver and His cross and thou shalt live; but if not thou shalt surely die an evil death, thou and thy companions, and all who will not deny Christ and the cross." The old man said to him, "Truly I am grieved for all the Christians my companions, who have been with me in the city, to whom I spake, but they would not hearken to me. For I was prepared to come out against thee to combat and fight with thee for the name of Christ, and either you kill me or I kill you; for I was relying on Christ my Lord to give me victory over you. But my companions would not allow me to do this. Again I desired to lead my family and servants alone and go out against you to fight with you, but the Christians shut the city gates and would not allow me to go out. Again I told them to guard carefully the city, and not to open the gates to you, and was relying on Christ my Lord that the city be not subdued by you, seeing that in it there was nothing that lacked. But in this again my companions did not hearken to me. And when you sent them an oath, I told them not to believe you, telling them that you were false and the truth was not in you. But my companions would not be persuaded to hearken to me, and now in my old age you are telling me to deny Christ my God and become a Jew like you. Yet I should not survive a single hour or one day after I had denied (Him). You seek to alienate me from Christ my Lord in my old age. In truth thou hast not spoken like a king, nor acted like a king, for a king who is treacherous is no king. I have seen many kings, but I have not seen kings who are treacherous. I still am ruler over myself, and in my dominion I will not be false to Christ. Far be

it from me to deny Christ, God, in Whom I have believed from my youth, in Whose name I was baptized, Whose cross I adore, and for Whose sake I die. In truth I am blessed, in that in my old age Christ has thought me worthy to die for Him. Now, indeed, I know that Christ has loved me, for long have I lived in this world through the bounty of Christ my Lord. Happily have I lived and I have lacked nothing. Children and grandchildren, lineage and all things has Christ my Lord given me abundantly in this world. In many battles have I been victorious through the power of the cross. I am confident that remembrance of me will not fail in this city, nor among my family, knowing now that I shall not die for ever. For I know and am assured that like as when a vine is pruned its shoots increase, so our Christian people shall increase in this city. Do not pride yourself that you have accomplished anything, for lo, I am telling you that this city shall wax eminent in Christian living, and there shall be built again this church which today has by you been burned with fire. Christianity will have dominion and will command kings and rule, and will extinguish your Judaism. Your kingdom will pass and your dominion fail."

When the honourable and illustrious old man had said these words, he faced around behind him, and said in a loud voice to the faithful who were around him, "Have ye heard, my brethren, what I have said to this Jew?" And they all cried out "We have heard everything that thou hast said, our father." Again he said to them, "Are these words true or not?" And they all cried out, "True and in truth are they." Again he cried and said unto them, "How does it seem to you? Is there perhaps among you

someone who fears the sword and would deny Christ? let him come out from among us." But they all cried out, "Far be it from us, far be it from us, to deny Christ. Be of good cheer, our father, be of good cheer. Do not be grieved about this, for we are all like thee, and with thee will die for Christ. There is no man of us who will remain alive after you." Again he cried aloud and said, "Hearken unto me all of you, Christians, pagans, Jews. If any one, whether my wife or my sons or my daughters, or any of my race or family, deny Christ and remain alive with this Jew who disbelieves in Him, he is not of my lineage or of my family, and I have with him no portion or share in anything. Everything that I possess, let it be for the church that later shall be built in this city after us. But if my wife or any of my sons or daughters remain alive by any chance, yet have not denied Christ, let everything be theirs, but those three properties that the church will choose let them be for the church."

Having said these things to all the people, the old man turned toward the king and said to him, "Lo, thou hast heard for thyself all these things; do not now recommence asking us anything of this kind. Far be it from us to deny Christ our God. Behold now there is no obstacle to our dying for Christ. Behold the moment of eternal life. Rejected be everyone who denies Christ. Rejected be everyone who does not confess that Christ is God and the Son of God. Rejected be everyone who does not confess the cross of God. Rejected be everyone who submits to you and to the Jews your companions. Behold we stand before you. Whatsoever you desire to do, do. Truly I tell you, I am wont to drink the first cup at the banquet before my com-

panions, so now this cup of death for Christ's sake, let it be mixed first for me. Behold I seal myself and all my companions, as is our custom, with the life-giving sign of the cross, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Then they all cried out, "Amen and Amen," and sealed themselves with the sign of the cross. And all cried out, "Rejected be everyone who denies Christ. Be of good cheer, our father, be of good cheer. Behold Abraham the Patriarch, an old man like thyself, gazes upon thee. Rejected be everyone who denies Christ and remains alive after thee."

When the king saw that there was no hope that they would deny Christ, he commanded that they be brought near to the valley that is called Wādī, and ordered their heads to be cut off, and their corpses cast into the valley. When they came to the valley they stood all of them together and stretched forth their hands to the heavens and said, "Christ, our God, come to our help. Christ, our God, give us strength. Christ, our God, receive our spirits. Christ, our God, may the blood of Thy servants, which is being shed for Thy sake, be acceptable unto Thee. Christ, our God, make us worthy of the vision of Thyself. Christ, our God, behold we have confessed Thee as Thou hast taught us, do Thou confess us before Thy Father as Thou hast promised us. Christ, our God, build this church that has been burned this day by this Jew. Christ, our God, appoint a Bishop for this city in place of the saintly Mār Paul, whose bones have been burned this day by this Jew." And they all cried out, "Let us salute one another." Then after they had saluted one another, the old man stretched out his hand to them and spake, crying out, "The salvation of Christ, which was given to the

thief on the cross be with our brethren." And the robust men, the companions of the old man, ran and were supporting him, and bringing him near to the executioners like the master of a banquet, rejoicing and saying, "Christ receive our father, and us with him, for we are being put to death for Thy sake." Then the old man knelt down on his knees, while his companions were holding and supporting his hands, like to Moses on the top of the mountain. Then the executioner smote and cut off his head, while his companions ran and took his blood and rubbed it on their faces and on their bodies as an act of piety. And everyone of them, wherever he saw a sword unsheathed, ran and knelt on his knees to receive the sword. Thus did they all receive the sword. Now the name of that illustrious victor was Ḥārith b. Ka'b.

This also that follows was not written in the letter to Mundhir, but that man who came from Najrān, told as follows. There was a child of three years whose mother was brought out to be put to death, and his mother was holding on to him as he was running along. But when he saw the king sitting clothed in royal robes, he broke from his mother and ran and embraced the knees of the king. The king took him and began to caress him and say to him, "What do you desire, to go and die with your mother or to remain with me?" The child said to him, "O Lord, O Lord, with my mother do I wish to die, and for this did I come out with my mother, for she said to me, 'Come, my son, let us go to die for Christ's sake.' But let me go and return to my mother, lest she die and I see her not, for she told me that the king of the Jews had given command that all who would not deny Christ should die, and,

O Lord, I am not denying Christ." The King said to him, "And how do you know Christ?" The child answered, "O Lord, every day I see Him in the church with my mother, and if you will come to the church I will show Him to you." The king said to him, "Do you love me or your mother?" The child answered, "O Lord, it is my mother I love better than you." The king said to him, "Do you love me or Christ?" The child answered, "O Lord, O Lord, the Christ do I love better than you, and He is better than you." The king said to him, "Then why did you come to embrace my knees?" The child answered, "Because I thought you were that Christian king whom I had seen in the church. No, O Lord, had I known that you were a Jew I would not have come to you." The king said to him, "I will give you nuts and almonds and figs and everything you desire." The child answered, "No, by Christ, I will not eat the nuts of Jews." The king said to him, "Why?" The child answered, "Because the nuts of the Jews are unclean; but let me go to my mother that she may not die and leave me alone." The king said to him, "Remain with me and be my son." The child answered, "No, by Christ, I will not remain with you, for your breath stinks, and my mother's breath is more pleasant than yours."

Then the king said to those who were standing before him, "See this evil root; he speaks thus even from his infancy. See how that deceiver and sorcerer has been able to deceive even a child." Then said one of the king's grandees to the child, "Come with me, and I will take you to the queen, and she shall be a mother to you." But the child answered, "May your face be buffeted. By the Lord, I prefer my mother to the

queen, for my mother takes me to the church. But let me go, for behold my mother has gone and left me alone." And when the child saw that the king would not let him go, he bit the king on the thigh, saying to him, "Let me go, Jew, evil one; let me go to my mother. Let me go, for my mother is dead and I want to die with her." Then the king lifted up the child and gave him to one of his grandees, saying to him, "Keep him, and when he is grown, if he deny Christ he shall live, but if not he shall die." So that man, who was his servant, took him, while he was howling and kicking his legs and crying to his mother, saying, "My lady, my lady, the Jews are taking me away. Come and get me that I may go with thee to the church." Then the mother when she beheld him, cried to him, saying, "Come, my son, I commit thee to Christ. Weep not, my son, behold I am coming to thee. Go, my son, and wait for me in the church near Christ, until I come, my son, Lo. I am making my way to you. Do not weep, my beloved. Behold, Christ is there in the church; beside Him wait for me, beside Him wait for me, my son, I am coming after thee." When she had thus spoken they cut off her head.

The following also was not in the letter of the king of the Himyarites to king Mundhir, but he who came from Najrān spoke thus, (telling) of how the little daughter of the blessed Dūmā, who was a girl of nine years of age, when she heard how the king told her mother to spit on the cross and deny Christ, filled her mouth with spittle and spat in the king's face, saying to him, "May you be spat at, who wert not ashamed to tell the queen my mother to spit on the life-giving cross and to deny Christ. May you be rejected, and all the Jews your companions;

and may everyone who denies Christ and the cross be rejected like you. Christ knows that my mother is better than thy mother, and that my lineage is better than thine, yet thou hast presumed to tell my mother to deny Christ and spit on the cross. May thy mouth be closed, Jew, killer of his Lord." Thus spake the daughter of that blessed one to the king, and straightway she was slain, and her sister, as was written above. The name of that worthy and victorious matron was Dūma, daughter of Azmeni.

Now when letters such as these were read before Mundhir the king, and before many, there was great sorrow among all the Christians. And straightway we wrote a copy thereof, and sent it to you, beloved, urging that swiftly and in haste, without delay or negligence, these matters be made known to the reverend and holy bishops, fugitives with Christ in Egypt, that by their hands the Patriarch of Alexandria may get to know of all these things, that they may stir him up to write to the king of the Cushites not to neglect the affairs of the Himyarites, but swiftly and in haste may march (to their aid). These things have also been made known to the cities of the faithful Antioch, Tarsus of Cilicia, Caesarea of Cappadocia and Edessa, and other cities of the faithful, that they may make commemoration of the holy martyrs, male and female, of whom we have written above, and that they may pray for the tranquillity and peace of the holy church and the kingdom. Let the Bishops also know how the Jews are destroying the asylum of the church and the oratory of the Roman martyrs. These evil deeds the Jews and their companions are doing to the Christian people who are in the land of the Himyarites. Yet the Bishops of all the Roman cities, ancient and modern, in

order to gain a few pieces of money, sell to the Jews the church buildings and oratories of the martyrs, and they pull them down beneath the cross (i.e. even in lands under Christian rule). Those Jews who are in Tiberias send priests of theirs year by year and season by season to stir up commotion against the Christian people of the Himyarites. If the Bishops are Christian and desire to see Christianity flourishing, and are not partners with the Jews, let them urge the king and his grandees to take revenge on the chief priests of Tiberias and the other cities, so that they be shut up in prison. Yet we do not bid them to render evil for evil, but make them give security that they will not send letters or persons of quality to the king of the Himyarites, he who did all these evil things that we have written above to the Christian people of the Himyarites. Let them say to them that if they will not do this they will burn their synagogues, and they shall be expelled from beneath the cross, and the Christians shall have dominion over them. When the king of the Himyarites hears this perhaps he will wish to spare his Jewish companions and cease from persecuting the Christians. But I know that Jewish gold is flowing and covering up the truth, and that the vaunting of Jews and pagans is exceedingly great. Also love of silver and gold is strong in the church, and the love of the pastors has grown cold, for which reason the flocks are bereft of pastors who will suffer for their flocks. But what we say let they themselves do. That which has appeared is Christ, God, and a good pastor who gave Himself for His sheep, who provides help for His flock, bought by His precious blood. To Him be glory and honour, renown and reverence, now

and at all times, for ever and ever. Amen.

(Says) the writer—These things I found and searched out and learned from those who had gone and come from that region, who had been sent from the king. They say that the Cushites came upon that Jewish king, bound to his neck

pottery vessels of great weight, and cast him from a boat into the midst of the sea. Then there reigned a king named Alparna who built a church and an oratory for those blessed ones, by whose prayers may the humble writer be kept from all evil. Amen.

Finished is the story of the Himyarites.

BOOK REVIEWS

Moirs. Fate, Good and Evil in Greek Thought. By William Chase Greene. Harvard University Press, 1944, pp. ix + 450. \$5.00.

This is not a book to read and review and then place upon your book shelf where you may consult it perhaps once in six months; this is a book to keep at your elbow, because it is a guide to the most important phase of the most important body of thought our world has known. What Archbishop Temple said of Greek political thinking, in the preface to his *Essays in Christian Politics*, is equally true of Greek ethical thinking generally. No problem which faces our modern world was unknown to the ancient Greeks, and no answer which has been proposed in modern times was unknown to them. Often their thinking about the question brought out difficulties and provided answers beyond those which have been considered in even the most radical or most thorough-going of modern thinkers. It was partly the consequence of the unique experience of the Greek people, partly because they were the first on the scene, partly because of a rare and indefinable genius for clear thinking, partly for reasons still unknown, that Greek ethical thinking traversed the whole field, two and a half milleniums ago. The problems arise, of course, not in the realm of pure scientific ethics, but in that area where ethics and religion overlap.

"That this is on the whole a good world, and that man is on the whole happy, we are generally agreed; at least man struggles to prolong his life as if it were worth living. Yet he is confronted also by pain and sorrow and vice, and their origins are often obscure. Even good is sometimes turned to evil; even

evil seems sometimes mysteriously to contain elements of good. We assume that everything must have its cause, and we ordinarily push the ultimate cause of all things back to God. Yet this very assumption results in making God responsible for evil as well as good, and at least raises the question whether man is responsible for his actions, good or evil. Shall we suppose that God is imperfectly good, or that He is good but not omnipotent? Shall we set Fate above God? Shall we suppose that God is still developing, or is manifesting Himself only gradually? Shall we break the world apart, and recognize a Devil as well as a God? Shall we, in order to preserve the freedom of the human will and its goodness, dispense with divinity, and recognize only a material universe in which moral values are of purely human origin and relevance?" (p. 3).

Professor Greene has evidently given his best thought for many years to the study of these questions and to the ancient Greek discussion of them—as his numerous contributions to the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* indicate. The work is a magnum opus and into it a brilliant interpreter of Greek thought has poured the refined essence of conviction distilled through years of expert study. It will come as a surprise to some readers to discover that the early lyric poets of Greece were not simply morose misanthropes who thought life short and gloomy and sought to drown their woes in drink; nor were they pure hedonists for whom wine, women, and song was all that mattered. They were men on the contrary who were revolving some of the profoundest problems of religion and ethics. There is also an excellent account of Orphism, stressing its

early origins and the long survival of its influence. The work of the dramatists is taken up book by book. Dr. Greene is not convinced that Euripides was a "rationalist." Instead Euripides was himself bewildered by the facts of life—he is "baffling because he is himself baffled" (p. 174).

The problem is dealt with next in its philosophical development, in the pre-socratics, in Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics. I am glad to see that Professor Greene uses James Adam's wonderful translation of the *Hymn of Cleanthes*—and also that he rates Chrysippus at his proper height. Incidentally he corrects the popular impression of Posidonius; for more than a generation now, German scholars have persuaded us that the dim figure of Posidonius stood, gigantic and powerful "within the dim unknown," responsible for all the nobler religious developments of the Middle and Later Stoa. Not that he was an unimportant figure or that he lacked influence—quite the contrary; only, for Professor Greene his claims upon our interest are more specific than has usually been supposed, whereas his religious influence was over-rated (see p. 352).

One of the most valuable features in this book is the long series of 68 Appendices which give bibliographical material, quotations, references, and parallels for most of the leading ideas in the book. Another extremely important and valuable feature, especially in the earlier chapters, dealing with the early poets, is the translation of important passages.

Dr. Greene's book is really a handbook to the development of Greek religion and ethics, so far as it relates to what Eucken used to call "the problem of human life." It is a guide to one of the two major antecedents of Christian thought—one which is coming to be recognized as equally important with the Old Testament. In fact there are many passages in ancient Greek literature which deal as seriously with the problem of evil as does the book of Job in the Old Testament. Unlike the book of Job—or its author—the ancient Greeks insisted a little harder upon reaching a conclusion. They were not willing to place their hands over their mouths and acknowledge their finitude and mortality, and the impropriety of questioning the Eternal. The Greeks were polytheists. They were lovers of the gods—as Zielinski insists, they loved their gods per-

haps more than any other nation—and for that very reason they could suppose that the gods themselves were somehow caught in this cycle of causation and had to find a way out. Take Demeter, for example, in the most beautiful of the Homeric Hymns! She is a divine being who suffers all that any human mother can suffer in the way of separation and bereavement, and even of terror, when she finds that her child has disappeared. She is no remote, unapproachable Olympian. You might almost say she is "bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh." To this extent, at least, the Demeter of the Hymn is closer to the conception of the divine being, i.e. of God, which we find in the gospel of Christ and in the doctrine of the Incarnation than that set forth in the Book of Job. There was some advantage then on the side of Greek popular anthropomorphism, although it was counter-balanced by a sense of the dark destiny which stood behind the throne of Zeus and really controlled the realm of the gods as well as that of men. But at any rate the stories, the myths, the popular tales of the gods became, in the hands of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, the means of setting forth their profoundest insights into the meaning of human life.

The last word, I suppose, if there really was a last word, was ethical rather than metaphysical. You hear it with almost equal positiveness in the affirmations of an Epicurean and a Neoplatonist, curiously enough. In the wayside wisdom of the inscription set up by Diogenes of Oenoanda—in the memorable translation by Gilbert Murray—

Nothing to fear in God;
Nothing to feel in death;
Good can be attained;
Evil can be endured.

"Evil can be endured": the conception of *τλημοσύνη* is very old, even Homeric, and runs through all Greek thought, even to the latest period. "Good can be achieved," within limits, and under the set conditions of human life—and who can ask for more? Again, in Proclus' commentary on Plato's Republic: Evil is not derived from God, nor from matter, nor from some other being than God, nor in fact from any one cause or principle; instead, evils (plural)—he does not admit a "principle" of "evil") are a by-product, *παρὰ γένεσις*, of

certain partial and disconnected causes, something adventitious and accidental, which can readily be borne or left behind by the spirit on its way to the Supreme. "Thus there is no unmixed Evil, no evil thing that does not participate some vestige of Good" (E. R. Dodds' tr., in *Select Passages Illustrating Neoplatonism*, p. 99).

Perhaps these are not actually the last words to be said about the problem, though they were the last words of the ancient Greeks. But have we got beyond them, in all the centuries since?

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Union Theological Seminary

Pastoral Care of Nervous People. By Henry Jerome Simpson. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1945, pp. xiv + 194. \$2.25.

Books on psychiatry, psychology, counseling and other fields related to pastoral care are appearing with such frequency that it is difficult to keep up with them other than superficially. Nevertheless, the demand continues to exceed the supply because more and more clergymen are becoming aware of pastoral opportunities and needs. Mr. Simpson describes his contribution to this field as "an elementary hand-book" but the procedure or methodology which he describes is anything but elementary; in fact the average parish minister would find it very time-consuming to secure the detailed personal history which he advises.

Chapter I provides an excellent description and evaluation of the various psychological approaches to the problems of "nervous" disorders and constitutes by far the best section of the book. It is significant (and also characteristic of the present state of pastoral care) that only one out of the eleven pages covering "Procedure for a Pastor" (Chapter II) deals with a specific contribution of religion to the therapy for nervous people.

The author recognizes the "one-ness" of man and rightly stresses the interdependence of mind and body. Nevertheless, it is obvious that he has been influenced more by the biological than the psychoanalytical approach to the understanding of neuroses. He draws heavily upon such authorities as Meyer, Billings and Richards but fails to mention others equally responsible for recent leadership in the

field of personality, such as Menninger, Horney, Deutsch, Allport, Kraines, Rogers and Harding.

The chapters dealing with the various neurotic and psychotic states are frequently too technical for the pastor and the multiple classifications tend to confuse. The two most common neuroses, and those most likely to be encountered by the minister (viz., anxiety and hysteria), are not recognized as such. The author even seeks to avoid using the word "hysteria" because it is misunderstood by laymen. He fails to note one of its most common symptoms—i.e., frigidity or lack of psychosexual development—and furthermore says nothing about some of the more obvious physical characteristics of the hysteric.

The continued use of the word "psychoneurotic" tends to make it take on the morbid fascination of a hobgoblin. This reviewer regards it healthier to recognize such a person as merely one suffering from a serious emotional disturbance.

There is no recognition of homosexuality even though it constitutes a frequent pastoral problem. The author seems to assume that sexual delinquency is due entirely to uncontrolled passion and apparently fails to recognize that accumulated clinical experience now indicates that such conduct frequently is symptomatic of either hostility or insecurity. The consideration of masturbation is too light and too simple. Despite these weaknesses this is not "just another book." While the author perhaps is over-confident and optimistic as to the pastor's ability to treat neuroses, nevertheless, he is rightly insistent that we cannot continue to ignore the need for real help. Many emotional crises can be treated by clergymen, many people are particularly resistant to psychiatry as such, and few capable psychiatrists are available. Mr. Simpson has made a helpful contribution to the rapidly developing field of pastoral care and he is to be commended for sharing his insights with us.

ROLLIN J. FAIRBANKS

Institute of Pastoral Care, Boston

Meet Amos and Hosea. By Rolland Emerson Wolfe. New York: Harpers, 1945, pp. xxx + 180. \$2.00.

The purpose of this book, as its title indicates, is to introduce Amos and Hosea to the

intelligent Bible reader. It treats each prophet in turn, beginning with a brief introduction, continuing with a translation and running exposition, in short chapters, of successive passages (a "commentary in story form," p. xxvii), and closing with an estimate of his work and influence. A historical sequel completes the book. The autobiographical material in Hosea 1-3 is inserted between chapters 8 and 9.

The author modifies the usual picture of Amos and Hosea at several points. Amos gave eleven addresses in Samaria and Gilgal before he came to Bethel, where he was "stopped by the high priest before having a chance to deliver any speech to the people" (p. xxv). Probably he refused to obey Amaziah's order to leave the country and "was imprisoned and executed" (p. 60). The probability has become a certainty on p. 160). Hosea never took Gomer back, but had her put to death as an adulteress (p. 86). The story of the remarriage in Ch. 3 is secondary; so are all the promises of Israel's restoration.

The book is marred by several flaws. There are many instances of infelicities in its English. While the author has a poor opinion of the work done by previous scholars on Hosea; "most interpretations of Hosea" go "far astray" (p. 81), he is apparently untroubled by any misgiving as to the correctness of his own reconstruction. He has unbounded confidence in the ability of criticism generally to obtain reliable results—ignoring the fact that those who use it come to varying conclusions. In his rejection of material as secondary he follows Marti's principle of eliminating passages of promise more rigorously than Marti himself, declaring that "only between forty and fifty per cent. of the content, in the collections which bear the names of Amos and Hosea, actually came from their lips" (p. xvii). He displays a tendency to let his imagination take the place of facts. Amos, for instance, was unmarried, and a martyr; he received his call when a lion devoured one of his sheep (p. 10). Hosea was a farmer whose land lay in the plain of Esdraelon (p. 74). He began his work in Samaria (p. 91), spoke in Gilgal (p. 133) and returned to Samaria (p. 135). Such use of imagination may well be allowable. Less happy, however, is the way in which he belittles the religion of Israel before Amos, ignoring its noble elements and

playing up its limitations, if not exaggerating them. To him, Moses and Elijah were not worthy of the name prophet (p. 68).

In saying all this, however, we must bear in mind that he expects to follow the present popular treatise with a technical publication which will contain the reasons for all judgments and conclusions here assumed. Our criticism, therefore, may well be too hasty. In any case we owe him gratitude for doing an honest and painstaking piece of work. His exposition of the prophetic oracles is on the whole excellent. His translation is interesting and will throw fresh light upon the text for the reader who knows only the English. His book will certainly help to make Amos and Hosea better appreciated and loved.

FLEMING JAMES

University of the South

Problems of New Testament Translation. By Edgar J. Goodspeed. University of Chicago Press, 1945, pp. xx + 215. \$2.50.

In this fascinating little book, Dr. Goodspeed has displayed one hundred and fifteen passages from the New Testament which afford difficulty for the translator, and for each has presented the solutions offered by translators from Wyclif through the Rheims and King James versions to those of modern translators like Weymouth and Moffatt, appending at the close his own suggestion. In addition he has included the following useful and instructive material: chronological lists of the early and modern translations (pp. x-xiii), indices of readings and of passages cited (pp. 209-215); a "King James Glossary" giving the modern equivalents of some of the less familiar words and names in the version of 1611; and a winsome and persuasive explanation of the reasons for undertaking a retranslation, and the way in which it is done.

For purpose of illustration I have thrown a number of Dr. Goodspeed's examples together under several rough headings. (1) A number of the passages represent a failure on the part of the King James and frequently the other old versions to reproduce the sense of the original biblical idiom, e.g.: Mt. 5: 18, King James "one jot or one tittle," Goodspeed "one dotting of an 'i' or crossing of a 't';" Mt. 9: 10, King James "publicans and sinners," Goodspeed "tax collectors and irreligious

people"; Mt. 28: 9, King James, "all hail," Goodspeed "good morning;" Mt. 2: 1, King James "in the house," Goodspeed "at home;" Mk. 15: 2, King James "Thou sayest it," Goodspeed "Yes;" Mk. 15: 25, King James "And it was the third hour, and they crucified him," Goodspeed "It was nine in the morning when they crucified him;" Lk. 1: 69, King James "horn of salvation," Goodspeed "a mighty Saviour;" Lk. 2: 49, King James "I must be about my Father's business," Goodspeed "I must be at my Father's house;" Jn. 1: 11, King James "He came unto his own and his own received him not," Goodspeed "He came to his home, and his own family did not welcome him;" Acts 6: 2, King James "serve tables," Goodspeed "to keep accounts." (2) A second large group consists of passages where the readings of the ancient manuscripts, all of which have been discovered since 1611, correct and supersede the text used by the older versions: Mt. 6: 13, King James "for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen," Goodspeed omits; Mk. 6: 20, King James "he did many things," Goodspeed "he was very much disturbed;" Lk. 2: 14, King James "good will towards men," Goodspeed "peace to the men he (God) favors;" Lk. 18: 28, King James "we have left all," Goodspeed "we have left home;" Rom. 8: 28, King James "all things work together for good to them that love God," Goodspeed "in everything God works with those who love him . . . to bring about what is good." (Incidentally, in the discussion of this there is a misprint, "test" for "text" on p. 149); I Cor. 7: 38, King James "So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well," Goodspeed "So the man who marries the girl he is engaged to does what is right;" I Cor. 13: 3, King James "though I give my body to be burned," Goodspeed "though I give my body but do it in pride;" Eph. 1: 1, King James "to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus," Goodspeed "to God's people who are steadfast in Christ Jesus." (3) The third large class comprises instances where the King James version is inaccurate or mistranslates: Mt. 2:1, King James "wise men," Goodspeed "astrologers;" Mk. 4: 10, King James "descending upon him," Goodspeed "coming down . . . to enter him;" Acts 1: 1, King James "The former treatise

I have made," Goodspeed "In my first volume;" Rom. 1: 1, King James "a servant of Jesus Christ," Goodspeed "a slave of Jesus Christ;" II Thess. 2:2, King James "as that the day of Christ is at hand," Goodspeed "to the effect that the day of the Lord has already come;" Phm. 9, King James "being such a one as Paul the aged, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ," Goodspeed "Paul no less an envoy of Christ Jesus, though now a prisoner for him;" Jas. 3: 1, King James "be not many masters," Goodspeed "not many of you should become teachers." In addition there are passages where the English of 1611 is obscure, as in Luke 2: 7, King James "wrapped him in swaddling clothes," where clothes has the force it has in "bedclothes," meaning simply "cloths;" or where the literal, word for word method of the earlier versions is misleading, as in I Tim. 5: 22, King James "Lay hands suddenly on no man," which means "Never ordain anyone hastily;" or where additional light is brought to bear on the passage from the papyri or other literature, as in Acts 1: 18, King James "falling headlong," which should be "swelled up and burst open;" or where the King James is obscure, as in Romans 12: 19, King James "give place unto wrath," which should be "leave room for God's anger;" or where the King James has failed to translate, as in Mt. 23: 5, "phylacteries," which means charms or amulets; or where a misprint is allowed to remain (!) as in Mt. 23: 24, "which strain at a gnat," which should be "strain out a gnat."

These examples may serve to show how a new translation improves and clarifies the text. Of course the last thing that should be inferred is that Goodspeed (or any other modern translator) is simply tinkering with the King James Version. The purpose of the book is to show the reader how the translator works, beginning not with a translation, but with the best Greek text critical scholarship can afford, then making his own translation, and finally consulting all the versions for whatever suggestions they may contain.

The discussion aims to introduce the reader into a translator's workshop and to show him the tools and materials with which the translator works at his great task, which is, with all the aids learning can provide—translations, commentaries, grammars, lexicons, concord-

ances, papyri, inscriptions, monographs, articles, everything he can reach that bears on the subject—to find out just what each of the New Testament writers meant each sentence to convey; and then to set himself to cast that thought in such English as the translator would have used if he had thought of it himself; English so natural and easy that the reader will forget he is reading a translation and be led on and on by the sheer ease of the English style until he has read a whole letter or a whole gospel at a sitting, as they were intended to be read; and begins to realize that the New Testament does not consist of chapters and verses but of living, coherent books whose main values are only gained through intelligent, continuous reading, and that any one of them may be read through aloud in a couple of hours (pp. 1 f.).

The book succeeds admirably in its task, and it is difficult to imagine anyone who would not be enlightened and fascinated by its graceful pages. It is most heartily recommended to all students of the New Testament, to preachers, and to those of the laity (and clergy?) who may feel a vague distrust of modern versions because they do not know just how they are produced.

HOLT GRAHAM

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

Advance through Storm. (A History of the Expansion of Christianity, Vol. VII.) By Kenneth Scott Latourette. New York: Harpers, 1945, pp. xiii + 542. 12 maps. \$4.00.

With the completion of Professor Latourette's *magnum opus*, the successive volumes of which have from time to time been noticed in these columns, a final appraisal may be in order. As a minutely detailed account of the spread of Christianity throughout the world from the first century to the present, as an encyclopedia of the *where* and *when* and *by whom* of Christian world-missions, it is and doubtless will long remain unique and indispensable for reference purposes. With commendable diligence and rare persistence Dr. Latourette has carried forward his plan on the same thorough scale from the first volume through the seventh, and with a rapidity truly amazing. But to some it will appear an occasion of regret that the execution of the work has been dominated by geography rather than by personality, by sometimes arid statistics of missionary achievement rather than by the warmth and heroism of individual or group

dedication to the task of evangelization. In the present volume, for example, Albert Schweitzer is dismissed in precisely seven lines. This is to say that the story is told without the relief and perspective characteristic of historiography of a high order.

Dr. Latourette has repeatedly affirmed his conviction that today Christianity is more fully a living force than at any time in the past. Obviously, he would not claim that geographical extension is the sole legitimate measure of its strength; nevertheless, he frequently writes as if this were the chief criterion. Thus to assess the vitality of Christianity in terms of geographical areas occupied, rather than in terms of areas of life and conduct dominated, is an over-simplification of which students of modern thought and culture cannot fail to be conscious. Whether we like it or not, we can hardly escape the fact that along with its increasing geographical spread Christianity has suffered loss of control over large sections of life which once it dominated; and this fact is not to be ignored in any estimate of its present or future "strategic position."

The present volume covers the three decades from the outbreak of World War I to the date of writing. It has indeed been "advance through storm," as has the whole course of Christian history from its first years. There are the usual detailed regional chapters; a summary of the "first three post-1914 decades"; a summary of the whole ground covered in the seven volumes; and a prophetic glance into the future in which Latourette once more avows his faith in the bright tomorrow of Christ's religion—certainly not through any syncretizing process, but through "uncompromising loyalty to him through whom it had come to birth and who in all its ages had been the acknowledged master of its most flaming spirits." It is on this high note of hope, to which we fully assent in faith while we question the validity of certain of his specific criteria, that America's unrivaled historian of Missions concludes the task which has occupied him over the years since 1937. He has earned our gratitude as he has informed us and encouraged us to face the Church's future undismayed—but in candor it may hardly be said that he has entertained us.

P. V. NORWOOD

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

How to Think of Christ. By William Adams Brown. New York: Scribners, 1945, pp. xxii + 305. \$3.00.

The subtitle is "a book for people who feel there is more to be found in the Lord Jesus Christ than they are able to understand." These words set forth clearly the character of the book. The author does not attempt to present a final and complete answer to the eternal secret of the nature and person of Christ. In fact, Dr. Brown frankly acknowledges that the Church has never been able to resolve the mystery of that Person in whom there are two natures, a human and a divine. All that the fathers who drew up the Chalcedonian creed and definition could do was to state that in Jesus the Christ there was a complete union of the human and divine natures, and yet at the same time a difference between them. "All that they decided was that any man who could affirm both union and distinction had a right to his place in the Church." There is more in Christ than the human intellect can ever fathom.

This book is tremendously interesting and rewarding because it presents sympathetically the different ways in which men have approached Jesus and sought to understand Him. There are the philosophers, the theologians, the historians, who have come to Him through the power of the intellect. Generally their answers to the problem of Christ have failed to bring joy and life and life to their readers because Jesus is one who appeals to the whole personality of man—to his affection, imagination, will and intellect—and they have concentrated too much on the rational implications of his life for men.

A second group of interpreters of Jesus' life is to be seen in those who supplement reason by authority. Here we find the lawyer's Christ, the Christ of the clergy, and the soldier's Christ. The lawyer's Christ is assumed in the claim of the Roman Church that the pope is the vice-gerent of Christ, and therefore, the final authority both in matters of religion and in matters of the state. The same Christ is found in Protestantism's theory that Christ died on the cross to satisfy the justice of God. The Christ of the clergy is He who, for the devout Catholic, actually comes to him through the sacraments dispensed only by the Church. For the Protestant it is He who speaks His

word in the Bible. The soldier's Christ is He who aids and strengthens his followers in their constant conflict with evil.

However, the answers of the intellect supplemented by authority have also been unable fully to express what men have found in Jesus Christ. Others have gone out on ventures of their own with Christ, to find answers to the mystery of the richness and wonder of His life through the imagination, the will, and the heart. Thus we have the artist's Christ, the Christ of the disciples and the Christ of the saints. The artists have found in Him a superhuman beauty. The disciples approaching Him through the will seek to follow Him as an example for daily living. The saints have come to Him through the affections and have shown us what it means to fall in love with Him.

In the concluding part of his book, Dr. Brown emphasizes that Jesus brings the distant God near to us. God, through and in Christ, enters the stream of humanity's life. "Jesus is the window through which we see as much of God as it is given finite man to see." This statement of course cannot be proved but the author's aim in writing this book has been an attempt to "discover what is involved in that affirmation."

This book will be gratefully received by the many admirers of Dr. Brown. Published posthumously, and edited by Henry P. Van Dusen, it is a final and fitting testimony to a long and fruitful Christian life. All of those interested in the Christological problem will find it of great significance.

PAUL S. KRAMER

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

Prayer and the Service of God. By Daniel T. Jenkins. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1945, pp. viii + 135. \$1.50.

Nathaniel Micklem in a recent book [*Congregationalism and the Church Catholic*, 1943, page 20] voices the opinion that the Congregational theologians of England of the last generation have taken a leading part in "delivering Christian thought from bondage and restating it in the light of contemporary discovery." The boast is justified. Most Anglicans who have read the writings of Micklem, J. S. Whale, or P. T. Forsyth, that giant theologian of the early decades of our century,

will express a feeling of great gratitude. The New Evangelicalism (misnamed neo-orthodoxy?) which is rescuing Protestantism out of its humanistic morass has few wiser interpreters than the Congregational school which has grown up in Great Britain.

Daniel T. Jenkins is a new recruit to this group of witnesses. His earlier book, *The Nature of Catholicity*, was hailed by Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals alike as a notable contribution to the emerging ecumenical theology of our time. In that earlier volume (which is worth a long review by itself), Jenkins handles Catholic views of the Church sympathetically, but confronts them with the criticism which the revived evangelicalism of continental Protestantism has brought to the fore as against Catholic theology generally. In *The Nature of Catholicity*, the author's anchorage in the theology of Karl Barth (whom he there quotes freely) is clearly evident an emphasis upon the Word of God as spoken against as well as in the Church, upon the gulf between God and sinner, upon the Atonement as the only way by which man can approach the divine.

The present volume on Prayer is of a more popular character. References to the sources of the author's theological convictions are sparingly cited. But the anchorage is the same. It is the first study of prayer which I have met in which the presuppositions of the Biblical evangelicalism now regnant in the Protestantism of continental Europe are brought fully to bear upon the life of prayer. And whatever the experts may come to think of some or all of those presuppositions, they can, in this little book, be seen to be of momentous importance for the devotional life of even the humblest Christian. Prayer is still a universal common denominator across all ecclesiastical boundaries. What light can the New Evangelicalism throw upon it?

One meets throughout the volume the emphasis upon the gulf between God and sinner. Prayer is at once suspected when it ignores this gulf. Prayer is coming into the presence of God—the God of the Bible and of the Church. Only in the Faith revealed to us in the Bible can a man truly pray. Hence all sentimental, individualistic, and mystical forms of prayer are described as dangerous. It is no light thing to meet the true God. Any prayer which is not meeting the God of holi-

ness of the Christian revelation can do great harm. "Prayer as such is not necessarily a good thing. Unless it is directed to the right Person in the way He has laid down, it can become a demonic thing and do untold damage to men and nations" (p. 17). Or again: "The whole history of the race testifies to the ambiguity of prayer. It can be a highly dangerous thing, the most subtle and effective means of hiding man from the face of God." "We must become new creatures before we can pray aright. We must lose ourselves and find ourselves anew in the one Mediator between God and man, even Jesus Christ" (pp. 34 f.).

These few sentences alone would, for me, make this little volume invaluable. They are right. The whole topic of prayer has, in recent generations, been at the mercy of mystics or sentimentalists. It is high time that some theological criticism be applied to it. Our familiar hymn defines prayer as "the heart's sincere desire." That definition may apply to prayer as a universal human phenomenon. Christianity did not invent prayer! But not all prayer is Christian prayer. If prayer is the voicing of desires, what are these desires? And to whom are they addressed? They can be addressed to idols, to gods of our making, and even to demons. Or prayer can be "a monologue of the soul with itself" (p. 101). Or it can ignore, as in much mysticism, the fact that union between man and God is possible only through the mediatorial work of Christ. Apart from the Church and the common life of brotherliness in Christ, prayer can become escape from the God of the Christian revelation. "The very Sacraments become means of individualistic piety and the living Word of the sermon a form of mass propaganda" (p. 117). Much of what the author says in criticism of wrong prayer could be in illustration of the text of St. Paul (Rom. 8: 26): "We know not what we should pray for as we ought."

The above quotations might give the impression that the book is a critical analysis of most prayer life as we know it. In a sense this is true. The book makes for sober thought. But the author's tone is positive throughout. Prayer is dangerous only when it is not anchored aright. It must come out of right Faith. And right Faith must come from contact with the Biblical revelation and from life within the Church, the Fellowship of the Holy

Spirit. The climactic chapters of the book are "Prayer and the Bible," and "Prayer and the Church." The author does not exactly discourage prayer which is not yet Christian prayer. "In one sense, it is unnecessary to ask ourselves whether we say our prayers. We all do. We all have a living relation to God whether we like it or not, even though our prayers may only consist in a silent defiance of His holy will and an obstinate refusal to heed His voice unto our own damnation" (p. 126). The author endeavors to lead us back to the corrective for all prayer—the Christian Faith, the Bible, the Church. Once more returned to these, the modern Christian's prayer, now often so thin and powerless and, at bottom, evidence of a "sacred unbelief," will be once more a meeting of God and sinner through Christ in the Holy Spirit. The cure for wrong prayer is right prayer. But right prayer can only be found by those who are willing to be confronted, in a divine-human encounter, by the God of Judgment and Grace of the Old and New Testaments.

I have touched upon only a fraction of this brief volume. More than one chapter not even mentioned would yield equally vivid insights. One of the best is "God's Ways of Answering Prayer." Another is "God's Will and our Prayers." The style of the book is a trifle heavy here and there. Nor is it as free from theological terminology as one might wish in a volume intended for laymen. But this only marks its richness.

THEODORE O. WEDEL

College of Preachers

Christianity and the Cultural Crisis. By Charles Duell Kean. New York: Association Press, 1945, pp. xii + 211. \$2.00.

This book is an able and solid tract for the times. It repays careful reading and rereading. Its purpose is to lay bare the age-old human problem as it is specially formed in our time by the crisis of our culture; and to reveal to us the processes by which our culture came to its time of visitation. The point of view is that which has come to be known as neo-orthodoxy, but it is used as a tool of analysis, not specifically expositied.

The author has made a valiant attempt to simplify and present the heart of the problem of Western culture. His thesis is that a com-

mon malady lies at the root of the disintegration of our culture and the proposed solutions to our problems. As Baal-peor was the beginning of Israel's apostasy for Hosea, so for Mr. Kean the blight came with the beginning of our modern culture. For simplicity's sake, he gives it a name, the *Harrington-Locke formula*. The content of this formula is the conviction that economic power is the determining fact in the political state and that the state exists primarily to protect property rights. Freedom is basically, therefore, the freedom of private enterprise. This formula, which represented a great truth in a particular moment of history, crystallized into a dogma, even as it was given new shades of meaning in different periods of modern culture. Wealth became money-wealth, dividends became the sole justification for investing in new productive enterprise, machine-power brought mass production upon which the unparalleled interdependence of modern life rests, mass production in conjunction with capitalistic economy brought the ills of present-day society. In the whole process, the basic character of our culture was changed so that community was lost in atomic individualism, security was lost in the midst of the greatest plenty and technological achievement, and the true ends of man were supplanted by economic values alone. Both educational and Christian institutions were dragged into the vortex and unconsciously serve the values of a society which has brought itself into frustrated internal conflict.

All of this is presented straightforwardly and with clear use of familiar facts all the way from *Tillie the Toiler* to what the sincere layman says in the parish discussion group. Mr. Kean tries to make us all face the basic fact that our culture is in an advanced state of collapse of which the war is a symptom no more than most of our idealist movements and realist power-politics.

He, therefore, offers us no immediate solutions, although he insists that Christianity must attack the enemy as it appears in every one of the concrete problems. He drives deeper than the political and economic problems and insists that only a complete reorientation of our culture will bring social health. This obviously is not the fruit of one generation's labor.

Christianity offers the fulcrum for this nec-

essary reorientation for three fundamental reasons. First, it is existential. One aspect of our cultural disease is the externalization of history which breeds oscillation between over-confidence and despair. In one mood, we trust ourselves to achieve scientific control over human destiny and believe too much in social planning, international structures and transformed economic systems. In another mood, we despair as the victims of too-great complexity and ill-fortune. Christianity will draw men into history where man is neither the master of historical forces nor the victim of fateful forces external to himself. It makes us responsible participants in a history whose Lord we know and serve. Secondly, Christianity gives us the true criterion for self-criticism, this same Lord of history, who humbles all human pretensions and saves us from the complacency of our success and the despair of our defeats. Thirdly, Christianity gives us the true ends of human community and continuous protection from their subtle transformation into false versions of themselves.

Most readers will probably agree with me that the author now owes us another good book, one which states and expands the point of view from which this one is written.

A. T. MOLLEGEN

Virginia Theological Seminary

Enough and to Spare. By Kirtley F. Mather.

New York: Harpers, 1944, pp. vi + 186.
\$2.00.

The possibility of a world economy of abundance is frequently mentioned, but on the other hand, the public often hears that our petroleum will be exhausted in the near future and that this or that will vanish in a short time. This book deals thoroughly with the problem of the material basis for humanity's future. The fact that there is *enough and to spare* for everyone in the world for an indefinite future is proved by three lines of argument. First, Dr. Mather gives a careful presentation of existent nonrenewable natural resources. With prudent and just use there is more than enough for every one "in freedom" for a thousand years. Second, modern science has an almost unlimited power to replace these nonrenewable resources. The comprehensive and detailed presentation of this fact will give the layman a new sense of the

power of scientific man. Third, the problem of population increase is faced and shown to be no obstacle to a world of plenty. This is the best statement and summary of this aspect of the world's social problem I have read.

All of this presupposes just and prudent use of what we have, rational use of the incredible power of scientific knowledge and method, and a world's commitment to a democratic and humanitarian end. The author, therefore, is led into the political problem. Here he is by no means a novice. The world's future, he reiterates, is an educational and religious problem. Political power must be used for humane ends achievable only when scientific knowledge and method are given full place in planning for the present and future.

"The revolution of our times involves the transition from international anarchy to international order and the advance from an uncontrolled, competitive economy to a regulated, co-operative economy" (p. 126). This statement opens the last chapter. "It is the challenge which a rational and human scientist presents to Western, indeed to World, man. But he presents it in a particular and special way to the citizens of the United States. "Our material resources are adequate for victory on all fronts; our intellectual resources are competent for the task of planning for freedom. Only our spiritual resources are in doubt" (p. 152). It is our challenge peculiarly because of our democratic tradition, our national power and our unique relation to other three great powers, Britain, Russia and China. "As a nation and as individuals we are being tested in the crucible of fate."

The reviewer has a few brief comments to make. First, every Christian ought to read this book. It is a modern and social formulation of *the law* which raises the problem of Romans 7 because it has the ethical content of Matthew 5. Secondly, because this is true, the profound Christian will not evade the challenge with the true Christian understanding that politically the author neither faces nor understands the problem of power and sin. It is solved by him, or at least soluble, through education and idealism. Religion is chiefly idealism. Thirdly, the Christian will use the situation so adequately described in this book as Christianity has always used *the law*, that is, as a tutor which leads us to Christ, as a phrasing of the command of Christ which

judges us at every moment, and makes us see the relevance of Christianity to our time, and as a goal to be realized to the greatest possible degree because Christ reigns over the world and because *the law* is the ethical quality of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the only begotten Son of God through whom Christians have their sonship and say, "Abba, Father." In short, the Christian will set this book in a dimension which sees a deeper struggle between Christ and the "principalities, thrones and powers" but he will not necessarily change anything that it says.

A. T. MOLLEGEN

Virginia Theological Seminary

War, Peace and Nonresistance. By Guy Franklin Hershberger. Scottdale, Pa.: The Herald Press, pp. xvi + 415. \$2.50.

This book is described in the foreword by Harold S. Bender (Chairman of the Peace Problems Committee of the Mennonite Church) as filling the "longfelt need for a comprehensive and authoritative work on non-resistance in Christian faith and history" (p. vii). It is at once a presentation of the Biblical teaching on war and peace, an analysis of positions held by Christians on this issue historically and at present, and an apologetic for the Mennonite stand. On the whole it is scholarly and able, well documented and furnished with select bibliographies at the conclusion of each chapter.

The opening chapter is a brief (13 pp.) sketch of the place of war in human history, followed by chapters on "Peace and War in the Old Testament" and "Nonresistance in the New Testament," and one on "Peace, War and the State in the History of the Church." The author then devotes five chapters to a sketch of the history of the Mennonites in the Old and New Worlds and in the period marked by the two World Wars—a moving report of staunch adherence to a difficult and unpopular conviction in the face of severe persecution and hardship. He returns to analysis in a chapter on "Nonresistance and the State in Modern Life," in which he defines the State as "primarily an organization for the maintenance of law and order, by means of coercion, in a sinful society" (p. 188), and the church as "a holy brotherhood, separate from the state," regenerate and therefore bound and

able to live a nonresistant life (p. 190). The nonresistant Christian cannot participate in coercion either police or military, and therefore cannot, in contrast to the Quaker, hold office in the state.

In the next chapter Professor Hershberger distinguishes the position denoted by "biblical nonresistance" from various kinds of pacifism, which are either not scriptural in their basis or sanction resistance or coercion of a non-violent nature. This treatment includes Quaker pacifists, liberal Protestant pacifists, exponents of the "Social Gospel," political pacifists, and proponents of non-violent resistance (Tolstoy, Gandhi, *et al.*).

Believers in Biblical nonresistance find the social gospel and the pacifism of religious liberalism inadequate, not because they do not contain some fine ideals, but because they have a wrong conception of sin, of Christianity, and of the kingdom of God. The New Testament sees a great gulf between God and the sinful world, a gulf which will continue until the final judgment, for not until then will sin be brought to an end. The kingdom of God which the New Testament speaks of is brought into existence only through the supernatural power of God Himself. It is made up of Christians who have experienced the saving grace of God in their personal lives; who have been saved from the sinful world to a life of service to God. Such Christians are concerned for the welfare of humanity, and their influence on society may be considerable. But such changes as this influence may bring about within the sinful society of the world, however worth while they may be, do not constitute the kingdom of God. The kingdom is made up only of those who have been redeemed from, and called out of, the sinful society (pp. 213 f.).

The author admits that his classifications are broad and general, and then proceeds to say, "The biblical nonresistant is the easiest to identify and classify. He renounces war because it is contrary to the teachings of the Scriptures, and he holds aloof from such activities of the state as are associated with methods of compulsion" (p. 230).

This analysis is followed by a survey of the present position of nonresisters and pacifists, and then a discussion of nonresistance as related to industrial conflict. The last two chapters discuss the service of nonresistance to society, subsumed under two tasks: "to maintain an unwavering testimony for the evangelical Christian faith, and to be on guard against any kind of pacifism or social service which has

its roots in human philosophy," and to live completely "the way of life set forth in the Sermon on the Mount and the writings of the apostles" (p. 294); and the need and the method for "keeping the faith." At the close there are several valuable appendices: one collecting passages from the scriptures that are the basis for the Mennonite position and discussing "some difficult Scriptures," one raising and answering twenty-two practical questions, and five comprising the documents of the Mennonite Church concerned with the matters discussed in the book.

The work is admirably suited to be a handbook for nonresisters. As an apologetic for nonresistance it will have certain grave faults for those who are not nonresisters or pacifists. In the first place, the approach to the Scriptures is, in a sense, naïve: there are two levels, the Old Covenant and the New, and the narrative is taken at its face value. There is little if any account taken of biblical criticism: e.g., what biblical scholars regard as a two-fold account of the institution of kingship by Samuel is explained by Hershberger as an instance of God's concession to the insistence of the people (p. 26). In the second place, the discussion of the Gospel ethic, the ethics of the epistles, and the conviction of the early church takes no account of apocalyptic expectations. In the third place, in the discussion of the wrath of God and of the place of coercion in sinful society reference is frequently made to a "divine law of cause and effect" whereby the sinner must suffer the consequences of his own sin. It is difficult to believe, but unless the reviewer misread badly, there is no discussion of the fact that the effects of sin are not confined to the sinner, that the innocent suffer with the guilty, and that a compulsion is thereby laid on the Christian conscience. In the fourth place, there is no adequate discussion of the relation of love and justice—they are apparently regarded as two discrete spheres. And finally, one is dissatisfied with the way in which the line is drawn between those functions of society in which the non-resister can and cannot participate. Can any body of men, except they seclude themselves in a self-sufficient community, really be aloof from the compulsive activity and the guilt of society?

HOLT GRAHAM

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

A Manual for Priests of the American Church.
By Earle Hewitt Maddux, S.S.J.E. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of St. John the Evangelist, 1944, pp. xii + 276. \$2.00.

This book is a considerable improvement upon its predecessors. First, a much larger proportion of its material is drawn from authorized service books of various sections of the Anglican Communion (probably because more is now available). Secondly, the translation of prayers from Latin sources is into good, clear and often euphonious English (which has not always been true of such handbooks). Thirdly, it is designed for use, even hard use. It is well bound, has many and sturdy ribbons, the print is bold and clear and the pagination does not interrupt prayers.

Where a Prayer Book Service is to be supplemented, that service is printed in full, undoubtedly in order to avoid handling two books. Both Offices for Burial are here intact. The Service at the grave is preceded by a form for the Blessing of a Grave adapted from the Scottish Book, and the Benedictus is inserted immediately after the Anthem "I heard a Voice," which is treated as an antiphon. Additional Services are provided for the Reception of the Body into the Church when the Burial Office is not to follow immediately, the Dismissal of the Body (entitled The Absolution of the Dead), the Burial of an Unbaptized Infant, and the Burial of Persons for whom the Prayer Book Service is not appropriate. Good additional prayers for the departed are added to those included in the Prayer Book, e.g., for a Mother, for a Bishop, for a Priest. The various circumstances of Holy Baptism are similarly treated. So, too, Unction. Among the remaining Offices there is a form for the Blessing of a Civil Marriage (from the Scottish Book).

The latter half of the book is taken up with benedictions for various and sundry person and things. Few priests will use every office and benediction provided, either for the reason which Father Maddux recognizes, that they will not have occasion to do so, or because they cannot approve of what is provided. This reviewer, for instance, while in hearty accord with the purpose of the handbook and the admirable way in which the purpose is executed, is frankly at a loss to explain why from a Society which is exceptionally careful for

the accuracy of its theology, there should issue a form for the solemn adjuration of salt and another of water in language which cannot be justified except by a tortuous logic—or why He who in the Gospels is represented as being much displeased at the disciples who would have kept young children from Him should

need the merits and intercessions of Apostles to make Him grant His blessing to boys and girls. These, however, are minor blemishes on a good book and should deprive no discriminating priests of its help.

HOWARD HENRY HASSINGER
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Sumerian Literary Texts from Nippur in the Museum of the Ancient Orient at Istanbul. By S. N. Kramer. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1944, pp. viii + 48 + 167 plates.

For students of ancient (especially Sumerian) history and culture, who can read the cuneiform, these 167 texts will prove a welcome addition to their contemporaneous documentary material. Although mostly very fragmentary, these documents are quite important, and Dr. Kramer has edited and described them with skill and insight. Belonging as they do to "the oldest written literature of any significant amount ever recovered," and containing epics, myths, hymns, lamentations, and "wisdom" compositions, they should prove very important for the study of the religious ideas of the Sumerians. The book forms Vol. 22 (1943-44) of the *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*.

S. A. B. M.

Sabbath: The Day of Delight. By Abraham E. Millgram. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1944, pp. xxx + 494.

This is a warm and enthusiastic discussion of the Sabbath and its observance—what it has meant and can mean to the Jews, and its place in Judaism. The Day could scarcely be given higher praise than it is here—"More than Israel has kept the Sabbath, it is the Sabbath that has kept Israel" (Ahad Ha-'Am). It is presented historically as the cornerstone of Judaism ("The observance of the Sabbath outweighs all the commandments of the Torah," Yer. Ned. 3: 9), and its observance is described as a joy and a delight.

There are included chapters on the traditional Sabbath, giving the three views of its origin, Sabbath observance in home and synagogue, the law of the Sabbath, and the modes

and problems of Sabbath observance today in America and abroad. The middle section of the book surveys the treatment afforded "Queen Sabbath" in literature, art and music. Since the work is intended to encourage and aid Sabbath observance by modern Jews, services for the home are printed, complete with music, and in the mid-section referred to above, examples of Sabbath songs and stories and even jokes are given, carefully selected and graded. For the same purpose, p. 394 contains a time chart for kindling the Sabbath lights, pp. 396-473 are a supplement containing the music for Sabbath services, Zemirot, graces, Oneg Shabbat songs, and cantillation modes, and pp. 474-486 contain a glossary and bibliographies.

Although the book is intended primarily for Jewish readers, it will commend itself to Christians as a charming and accessible presentation of Judaism. Barring a certain amount of repetition certainly excusable in a didactic work, and largely explainable by the presence of chapters and selections from other writers, it is beautifully written, simple and clear. The urbanity of its pages will beguile the reader swiftly into the middle section, where he will find his mind and imagination enraptured by the tales and traditions of Jewish lore, and the book will impart a flavor and fascination that will enable even those not familiar with Judaism to come to a sympathetic understanding of how the Sabbath can be kept as a delight and a priceless gift.

H. G.

The Philosophical Heritage of the Christian Faith. By Harold A. Bosley. Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1944, pp. xii + 176. \$2.00.

It has been said that the genius of the Anglican tradition is that it combines the Protestant and Catholic traditions, with the balance being provided by the inheritance of Greek

philosophy. Certainly most theologians find themselves in line with Plato, Aristotle, or Plotinus—unless they reject all metaphysical systems. In this little book (and the lectures total only 112 pages), Dr. Bosley has pieced together the contributions of the three greatest Greek thinkers around the themes of truth, beauty, goodness, and love. Then follow 53 pages of selections from their writings, a helpful bibliography, and an index. These lectures were given to ministers not very familiar with philosophy, and the simplicity of treatment makes this book valuable to the layman. Only in the last chapter does Dr. Bosley's distinctive position (made known in his excellent *Quest for Religious Certainty*, 1939) become clear as he deals with Charles Hartshorne and other modern theologians.

R. C. M.

They Found the Church There. By Henry P. Van Dusen. New York: Scribners, 1945, pp. xii + 148. \$1.75.

Yes, there were concentration camps at Majdanek, Buchenwald, and Dachau; the death march from Bataan really did take place; Negroes have been lynched in America, and multitudes have starved in India. We are all involved in tragedy and guilt. But it is good to hear another kind of story, and necessary if we are to maintain our balance. In this volume, which bears the subtitle "The Armed Forces Discover Christian Missions," Dr. Van Dusen brings together dozens of accounts of Christian love, generosity and heroism on the part of native converts and missionaries the world over. Usually they are in the form of letters from men of the armed forces, many of whose lives were saved by Christians of other colors. As the author says, the book was difficult to organize because there are so many accounts and their pattern is so similar.

They are great stories. Some of the best are those of the pilot paged by name in the jungle (p. 3), the speech at the dedication of the memorial chapel at Guadalcanal (pp. 44 f.), the description of life on Kusaie (pp. 73-78), and the story of the woman who wanted to learn about missions because her husband, an Army dentist, had come to deeper Christian faith after seeing mission work in Africa (p. 115). Indeed, future Christian ages may look back to the South Seas as we look back to the warm and moving tale of the early Celtic

and Anglo-Saxon churches. As Dr. Van Dusen points out, western "civilization" is moving into these isolated atolls, not all of its imports are wholesome, and the vigorous new churches will have their struggles with the world, the flesh, and the devil, in a still more dangerous form.

The stories of this book make one thing very clear. The Christian life, the response of faith and love to the preaching of the Word, is fundamentally the same, no matter what the locality or the denomination.

S. E. J.

Why Go to Church? By David K. Montgomery. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1945, pp. xvi + 174. \$2.25.

This is an excellent book for laymen who are skeptical concerning the value of churchgoing. Each chapter opens with an imaginary situation putting in the foreground the concerns of sincere doubters. Such statements and questions as the following are answered, usually convincingly: "I like to go to church when I feel like it"; "Why is the Holy Communion called the 'Lord's own service'"; "Can't we be good without going to church?"; "Why should we impose our religion on other peoples of other lands?"; "Why all the elaborate ceremonial and getting up and down?" The author has written simply and clearly and his arguments are, for the most part, convincing. His fundamental thesis seems to be that we must support the church in every possible way if we are to fulfill our confirmation acceptance of "Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour."

P. S. K.

"I am a Vestryman." By Theodore R. Lowell. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1945, pp. 109. \$0.50.

This useful little book by the Suffragan Bishop of Newark is described on the title-page as "a study outline for Vestrymen, organization leaders, candidates for confirmation and the ministry." In form it is a *brief* of the history of the Church, the organization of the Episcopal Church and of the diocese, and of the Vestryman's responsibilities to his Rector and to the Church, containing the sort of information which any well-instructed layman should wish to possess, and which Vestrymen, in particular, need to guide them in the intelligent discharge of their duties.

P. V. N.

Queen
oving
im-
new
the
more

very
e of
Vord,
t the
J.

gom-
1945,

o are
oing.
itua-
is of
ques-
ually
en I
inion
t we
Why
oples
cere-
an-
his
cing.
we
way
ances

K.
Lud-
945,

gan
page
ixa-
and
the
the
of
ctor
in-
man
nen,
in-

x.